School of Theology at Claremont
10011453351

THE
EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION

Edited by

A. J. MACDONALD, D.D.

EDUCATIONAL SU
STORES,
242 DALTON RO
BARROW-IN-FURN

D

The Library
of the
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

$\$20^{00}$ Sc

THE EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION

SOME OTHER WORKS BY THE CONTRIBUTORS

J. W. HUNKIN, D.D.—*Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Inter-Communion and Reunion.* (Heffer, Cambridge.) 2s. 6d.
The Earliest Christian Church (Cambridge University Press.) 2s. 6d.

A. J. MACDONALD, D.D.—*Lanfranc: His Life, Work and Writing.* (Oxford University Press.) 12s. 6d.
Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine. (Longmans.) 21s.
The Holy Spirit. (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d.

HAROLD SMITH, D.D.—*The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.* (S.P.C.K.) 2s.
Anti-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels. 6 vols. (S.P.C.K.) i—v 7s. 6d.; vi 6s.

T. C. HAMMOND, M.A.—*Transubstantiation.* (National Church League.) 6d.

W. H. MACKEAN, D.D.—*Christian Monasticism in Egypt.* (S.P.C.K.) 8s.

A. H. W. HARRISON, D.D.—*The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort.* (London University Press.) 12s. 6d.

V. F. STORR, M.A.—*The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century.* 1800—1860. (Longmans.) 14s.
Christianity and Immortality. (Longmans.) 8s.

823
.M25
1930

THE
EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION

Edited by

A. J. MACDONALD, D.D.

Rector of S. Dunstan's in the West; Fellow of the Royal Historical Society; Formerly Exhibitioner, Trinity College, Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE
W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED
1930

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

LONDON AGENTS
SIMPKIN MARSHALL LTD.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND

Preface

THIS book does not attempt to present an account of all the theories about the Eucharist which from time to time, in the long history of Christian doctrine, have been postulated. It traces down the centuries the Evangelical interpretation—the exegesis of those whose appeal is always first to the plain meaning of Holy Scripture, and who interpret scriptural language rather by the aid of chastened reason than by the canons of tradition. Yet this preliminary caution does not suggest that an incomplete statement of the doctrine of Holy Communion has been presented. It is the deep conviction of all the contributors that one interpretation was implied by the Lord in the words recorded in the Gospels and by S. Paul, and that this is contained in the Evangelical exegesis. In no field of Christian doctrine has the theory of development played a larger part than in that of the Eucharist; in no field was it less suitable or useful. Much depends on what we mean by the term "doctrine." If it means "theory," then development is probable if not necessary. If it means "teaching," then it cannot be developed, although it may be re-stated, re-applied, re-adapted. In so far as Christian doctrine consisted originally of statements uttered once and for all, the function of tradition is to preserve and to interpret; there can be no development until the appearance of a new revelation from on high.

This book is not issued by any organisation, society or group of Evangelicals; it is the work of a number of students, several of whom have devoted half a life-time to the periods which they treat. While each writer is responsible for his own statements, the Editor alone is responsible for the plan and method of the book. Canon Storr's concluding chapter should be read first as well as last, since it supplies a useful recapitulation of the preceding contributions, as well as a valuable summary of the situation to-day. The first three chapters have been read through by the Rev. J. H. McCubbin (formerly Senior Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge), and some valuable suggestions made by him have been included in the footnotes. It is hoped that the work may prove a serviceable contribution to current discussions, and may fill a gap in the growing body of sacramental literature. Short bibliographies have been attached to each chapter.

A. J. MACDONALD.

Contents

PAGE

PREFACE v

I. THE ORIGIN OF EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE (THE NEW TESTAMENT), by the Ven. J. W. HUNKIN, O.B.E., M.C., D.D., Archdeacon of Coventry and Rector of Rugby; formerly Fellow and Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge .. 1

II. THE FORMULATION OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE (THE GREEK AND LATIN FATHERS), by the EDITOR 40

III. SYMBOLISM IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES (from the Carolines to Berengar), by the EDITOR .. 85

IV. THE SCHOOLMEN OF THE LATER MIDDLE AGES (ABELARD, AQUINAS AND WYCLIF), by the Rev. T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Superintendent of the Irish Church Mission; formerly Senior Moderator, Trinity College, Dublin 118

V. THE REFORM OF DOCTRINE (CONTINENTAL AND ENGLISH REFORMERS), by the Rev. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., Tutor of S. John's Hall, Highbury; formerly Scholar of S. John's College, Cambridge 151

VI. ANTI-ROMAN APOLOGETICS (THE CAROLINES), by the Rev. W. H. MACKEAN, D.D., Residentiary Canon of Rochester 192

VII. ANTI-ROMAN APOLOGETICS (*continued*). (NON-JURORS AND HANOVERIANS), by the Rev. W. H. MACKEAN, D.D. 237

VIII. FREE CHURCH INTERPRETATION (FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT DAY), by the Rev. A. H. W. HARRISON, M.C., B.SC., D.D., Principal of the Westminster Training College 264

IX. ANGLICAN EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY TO-DAY, by the Rev. V. F. STORR, M.A., Canon of Westminster; formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford 311

INDEX 324

I. THE ORIGIN OF EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

THE NEW TESTAMENT

By J. W. Hunkin.

In studying the teaching of Holy Scripture with regard to the Holy Communion we shall take as our starting point the letters of S. Paul, and from them work back to the earliest records of the life of Christ, and forward to the rest of the New Testament and particularly to the Fourth Gospel. Nowhere shall we find a systematic exposition of the doctrine of Holy Communion: nowhere shall we find even a detailed account of the way in which the Holy Communion was celebrated by the Christians of the first century. Indeed we shall find surprisingly little about the subject at all in the New Testament: but that little is significant and sufficient.

S. Paul.

S. Paul's letters were called forth by a variety of circumstances, and they deal with particular situations and specific problems. It is in order to correct certain misconceptions and abuses among the Christians at Corinth that he refers to the subject of Holy Communion, and he does not deal with it at any great length. Almost every sentence which he has written about it has given rise to endless discussion. Yet some points are clear and others are gradually, through long study and research, becoming clearer.

The chief passages to be considered are found in two chapters in the first epistle to the Corinthians (x. and xi.). In 1 Cor. xi. 17–34, S. Paul is dealing with a gross abuse which had arisen in connexion with the fellowship-meal, which, we gather, was customary among Christian people.

"When ye come together in the church" (i.e. the gathering of the congregation of Christ; the word does not of course refer to a building) "I hear that divisions exist among you. . . . When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper: for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and put them to shame that have not?" (1 Cor. xi. 18–22).

The meal of fellowship is evidently a real hunger-satisfying meal. It is an established custom among the Corinthians. What can we learn about its origin?

THE FELLOWSHIP MEAL IN THE ACTS AND THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

References to such meals occur twice in the Acts (ii. 42, 46; xx. 7–11). The first of these passages describes how the band of disciples, reinforced by the converts at Pentecost, "continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of the bread and the prayers. . . . Day by day, continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved."

S. Luke is greatly impressed by the attractiveness of the new society of Christians and what he stresses here is the joyfulness of the daily family meal. But the expression which he uses, "the breaking of the bread," is not the ordinary expression for taking food. Like the corresponding expression in Hebrew,[1] it denotes the breaking up of a loaf for the purpose of distributing portions of it. The phrase occurs again in S. Luke's Gospel (xxiv. 35): "he was known of them in the breaking of the bread." The two disciples at Emmaus[2] recognised the Lord when "he took the bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them." We shall scarcely be wrong if we infer that the Lord had a characteristic way of doing this. And we are reminded that the expression "break the bread" is used in all the Synoptic narratives of the feeding of large numbers of people at a time.[3] It would seem, indeed, that the Lord had been in the habit of presiding at meals with His disciples and that these meals had, to some extent at all events, assumed a sacred character.

---

[1] E.g. Lam. iv. 4.

[2] Though presumably they had not been present at the Last Supper (Luke xxii. 14, Mark xiv. 17).

[3] Mark vi. 41, viii. 6; Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 36; Luke ix. 16.

Josephus[1] tells us that the Essenes, who in certain respects resembled the Christians (though in others they were markedly different), used to go to their meals in white garments "as though it were into a sacred temple," and had a priest to say grace both before and after.

Our conclusion is therefore that "in breaking bread at home" the disciples were only doing what some of them had been accustomed to do in the days when the Lord Himself used to preside at such meals. The meal was still a meal of religious fellowship at which men and women met as Christ's followers. In what way it was now associated with the Lord S. Luke does not tell us. He does not explicitly connect it with that most memorable meal which took place on the evening before the Lord's crucifixion. In view of the uncertainty of the text of his Gospel in the passage which describes this "Last Supper," it is a difficult question how far (if at all) he regarded the Christian meals as looking back to that particular occasion.

The second passage in the Acts to which reference must be made (xx. 7–12) records a fellowship-meal at Troas at which S. Luke himself was present: "upon the first day of the week when we were gathered together" . . . there follows a short account of the accident to Eutychus and his restoration. And then, when S. Paul had returned to the upper room "and had broken the bread, and eaten, and had talked with them a long while, even till break of day, so he departed." Here again the meal was evidently a real hunger-satisfying meal. It took place at a meeting for fellowship held in the evening at an hour when the Christians, mostly people in humble circumstances and some of them slaves, were free to come. We gather that at Troas "the breaking of the bread" occurred, or at all events there was a special meeting for that purpose, once a week on the first day (the day of the Lord's resurrection, Luke xxiv. 1). But again S. Luke gives no hint of any particular reference back to the "Last Supper." In this connexion it is to be noted that the *Didache*, the now famous early Christian manual originating probably in Syria at an uncertain date, seems to describe a Eucharist[1] which was a real meal and at which the Last Supper was not specifically recalled:

---

[1] *Wars*, ii. 8 (129–132).

"On the Lord's day of the Lord come together and break bread and give thanks (εὐχαριστήσατε) . . ." (xiv.)

The manner of giving thanks is set out in two earlier chapters of the *Didache* (ix. and x.)[2].

It may be that this is the kind of Eucharist that is in S. Luke's mind when he speaks of "the breaking of the bread." He certainly seems to regard it above all as family worship at a family meal. At such a family meal in a poor house it is doubtful whether wine would have been ordinarily provided.[3] Possibly the provision of wine was often confined to the first day of the week.

On the occasion of this particular "breaking of the bread" at Troas S. Paul was present. How far S. Paul himself would have been satisfied with such a form of Eucharist as that provided in the *Didache* is rather doubtful. He would probably have preferred a more specific reference to the Last Supper; for, less than a year before, he had written the passage in 1 Cor. xi. to which we have already referred, and to which we must now return.

After describing the abuses at Corinth in the words quoted above, the Apostle continues:

> "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

It appears indeed that it is precisely by emphasising the reference to the Last Supper that S. Paul hopes to cure the abuse of the fellowship-meal among the Christians at Corinth. S. Paul himself "had received" the tradition, which he believed to be traceable to the Lord Himself,[1] and which he had been careful to hand on to his friends at Corinth, that one purpose at least of the fellowship-meal was to recall the Lord to mind: "Do this with a view to recalling Me to mind." It is perhaps worth noting that the corresponding phrase used in connexion with the Cup is slightly different: "Do this as oft as ye shall drink it, with a view to recalling Me to mind." Does the phrase "as oft as ye shall drink it" suggest that, whereas "the breaking of the bread" in its simplest form might be simply a meal of fellowship, *whenever wine is provided* there must be the more specific reference to the Last Supper?

---

[1] *Cf.* ed. A. J. Maclean (1922), p. 24. On the *Didache* as a whole *cf.* Gore, *Church and Ministry* (1919), Note L (C. H. Turner), pp. 367 f.

[2] *Cf. infra*, p. 43 f. On the points of similarity between the service described in the *Didache* and the Jewish *Kiddush*, *cf. infra*, p. 7 f., and for more detail Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (1925), pp. 187 ff.

[3] *Cf.* G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua* (Eng. tr.), p. 180.

But what exactly took place at the Last Supper? We must examine with all possible care the brief accounts given us in the New Testament. Of the four passages to be considered, the earliest in point of writing is that already quoted from S. Paul (1 Cor. xi.). The account given in S. Matthew is clearly based on that recorded in S. Mark. The corresponding passage in S. Luke is particularly interesting, though it presents certain special difficulties of its own.

THE LAST SUPPER.

The first question we have to ask is whether the Supper was actually the passover meal which, according to the law, took place on the evening which began Nisan the fifteenth.[2] On the afternoon of Nisan the fourteenth the passover lambs were slain in the Temple; Nisan the fifteenth, the first day of unleavened bread, began at sunset that same evening. S. Mark (xiv. 1, 12, 16, 17) uses the Roman reckoning of the day, which is the same as the modern, from midnight to midnight, and says that it was on the evening of "the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover," that the Last Supper took place. According to this, while the Lord and His disciples were at their meal in the Upper Room the Jews all through the city were eating the passover.

[1] The preposition "of" is ἀπό not παρά (contrast Gal. i. 12). The verb "had received" (παρέλαβον) is similarly used of receiving instruction from a Christian teacher in 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3, Gal. i. 9, Phil. iv. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1, 2 Thess. iii. 6.

[2] Jewish days, it will be remembered, began in the evening.

S. Matthew follows S. Mark in this respect (Matt. xxvi. 2, 17, 19, 20); and so does S. Luke (xxii. 1, 7, 13, 14).

On the other hand, according to the Fourth Gospel (John xviii. 28) the passover was not eaten till the evening of the day on which Jesus was tried by Pilate and crucified. Jesus was therefore still hanging on the cross at the very hour when the passover lambs were being sacrificed in the Temple. S. John does not explicitly draw attention to the fact, but he does in the context quote words used in Scripture of the passover lamb (Exod. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12) and applies them to our Lord: "these things came to pass, that the scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken"[1] (xix. 36).

Modern scholars[2] are, on the whole, inclined to accept S. John's dating, chiefly on the ground that the events recorded on the day of the Crucifixion do not suggest that it was the first day of an important festival. If the chief priests and scribes could say "not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people" (Mark xiv. 2), it is not very likely that the procurator would have allowed not only the trial but also the Crucifixion to take place on so important a festival. It is, moreover, not easy to account for the carrying of arms (Mark xiv. 47) and the buying of the linen cloth (Mark xv. 46) on such a day.[3] Further, "the constant use of leavened bread for the Eucharist in the Eastern Church implies the Johannine tradition."[4]

It seems best then to follow S. John in this respect, and to seek for an explanation of the language of the Synoptists on the following lines. On Nisan the thirteenth Jesus had sent two of His disciples to take possession of the Upper Room and to begin their preparations. We need not be surprised that the room was secured one day beforehand, for preparations often began that evening.[1]

---

[1] Note also xix. 14: "it was the preparation of the passover."

[2] E.g. Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, pp. 130f.; E. Mayer, *Ursprung*, i. pp. 173f.; Burkitt, *J.T.S.* xvii (1916), pp. 291ff. *Cf.* also Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 156ff., and the references there given.

[3] According to *Pesachim* iv. 5, ordinary work did not continue beyond noon at the latest on the day preceding the passover. The arrival of Simon "from the country" (Mark xv. 21), as Dalman points out (*op. cit.* pp. 100, 101), does not necessarily imply that he had been working. *Cf.* "into the country," Mark xvi. 12.

[4] C. H. Turner on Mark. xiv. 12 (in the *New Commentary*, S.P.C.K.). In the West unleavened bread did not become usual until the Carolingian revival. Even in the Synoptic narratives the word used for bread is ἄρτος and not ἄζυμα, though the Synoptists use the latter word elsewhere (Mark xiv. 1, 12, Matt. xxvi. 17, Luke xxii. 1, 7); and there is no reference to the lamb which, after all, was the central element in the passover meal. Note also Justin, *Dialog. w. Trypho*, 111; Apollinarius of Hierapolis and Clement of Alexandria in *Chron. Pasch.* (Migne, *PG.* xcii, 80, 81.)

The room being at their disposal, it was natural for Jesus and His disciples to meet there (i.e. on the evening beginning Nisan the fourteenth) instead of going out of the city as they had done on the earlier days of the week. It further appears that their meeting included something of the nature of a *Kiddush*.[2] And this was almost certainly the only festival meal in which the disciples took part in connexion with the feast that year, for we cannot suppose that on the following evening, the evening of Good Friday, they could have brought themselves to join in any of the paschal meals that were being celebrated in the city. In later years they looked back upon it as the only paschal meal they had had. It had been, at all events, a meal full of paschal associations, for them it had been a paschal meal; and if they came, as they easily would have come, to speak of it as such, the way was opened for the little misunderstanding which gave rise to the synoptic narratives as we have them now.

The *Kiddush* (i.e. "the sanctification") has long been an integral part of Sabbath and Festival meals among the Jews. On Friday evening before the Sabbath meal the master of the house presides over the "Sanctification of the Day," according to a form provided in the Jewish Prayer Book.[3] Over a cup of wine he recites Genesis i. 31, ii. 3, and then pronounces the following blessing: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who createst the fruit of the vine."[4] This is followed by a benediction thanking God for the Sabbath. Wine is then drunk by all present. There follows a similar benediction over a loaf of bread: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth."[4] The company then partake of the bread. Nowadays the *Kiddush* rite precedes the meal, but Dr. G. H. Box[1] argues that at the beginning of the Christian era the order was reversed, and the *Kiddush* came after the meal. The evidence, however, appears to be rather slight. Dr. Box quotes from the *Tosephta* to *Berakhoth*, v. 1, which attributes certain *dicta* on the subject to Rabbis of the second century A.D. The *Tosephta* tells a story about three Rabbis who were reclining at a meal in Accho on Friday afternoon when the Sabbath day drew on, and the Sabbath day was sanctified over a cup of wine. In such early references to the Sanctification ceremony the benediction over the cup is mentioned in Rabbinic literature, but there is no actual reference to the partaking of it by the whole company present, though this may probably be inferred from later usage. There is no evidence, however, that at this early period the rite included a blessing and distribution of bread. Dr. Box therefore pictures our Lord and His disciples assembled for a meal on Friday afternoon, at the end[2] of which He consecrated a *Kiddush* cup as ushering in the passover.[3]

---

[1] "On the evening which begins Nisan the fourteenth it is necessary to make search for leaven by the light of a candle."—*Pesachim* i. 1. All leaven had to be removed before noon next day.

[2] *Cf. infra*, p. 8 f.

[3] *Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, 11th edition, London, p. 124.

[4] *Cf.* Ps. civ. 15.

The scantiness of the evidence does not permit of any certainty with regard to details. It may be that the *Kiddush* ceremony did include a benediction and distribution of bread even though no Rabbinic passage mentions it. But if so the later development and general Jewish usage strongly suggest that the benediction of the wine would have preceded the benediction of the bread.

The position of the *Kiddush* rite in relation to the rest of the meal may have depended upon the hour. If the meal began before sunset the *Kiddush* ceremony may well have taken place at the end. If, on the other hand, as may have been the case at passover time in Jerusalem, where so many families had to be catered for, the meal took place later in the evening (say about 9 p.m.) the *Kiddush* ceremony may well have come first.

---

[1] *The Jewish background of the Institution of the Eucharist* (*Jewish Guardian*, 7th December, 1923). See also Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 167 ff., and the references there given, particularly to Elbogen, *Der judische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (1913) and Elbogen's essay in *Festschrift zu Israel Lewys 70 Geburtstag* (1911), pp. 179 ff.

[2] The words "after supper" are found in the New Testament only in S. Paul's account (1 Cor. xi. 25). *Cf. infra.*, p. 25 f.

[3] According to T.B. *Pes.* 53a the Galileans were accustomed to regard the whole of Nisan the fourteenth as a strict Sabbath.

Thus, while we can infer nothing absolutely decisive with regard to the Last Supper from Jewish usages in connexion with the *Kiddush*, a certain probability suggests itself, that either the benediction of the wine must have stood apart by itself with a special character of its own; or else, if a benediction of bread was associated with a benediction of wine the latter would have preceded the former.

It is time to turn to the synoptic accounts themselves. It will be convenient to exhibit them in parallel columns for the purpose of comparison. But when we come to the third column we are met with a difficulty. What are we to set down as the text of S. Luke?[1] Here it must suffice to call attention to the following points:—

(1) Codex Bezae omits the words "which is given for you . . . poured out for you" (*vv.* 19b, 20), and this omission is supported by the old Latin version in general, and to some extent by the Old Syriac.[2] Hort goes so far as to say that there is "no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of S. Luke."

(2) But if these words be omitted the transition from *v.* 19a to *v.* 21 is extraordinarily abrupt:—"And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body. But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." Moreover, in two important manuscripts of the Old Latin (b, e) *v.* 19a is inserted at a different point in the narrative, viz. after *v.* 16: and in this they have support from the Old Syriac. It is possible therefore that the words "And he took bread . . . This is my body," are themselves also an insertion into S. Luke's original text; an insertion made after *v.* 18 in some authorities and after *v.* 16 in others. Clearly the passage runs much more smoothly if these words be omitted.[3] And further, if they be omitted the Third

---

[1] For a full discussion reference must be made to Hort (*Introduction*, Appendix pp. 63 ff.), Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, Eng. trans. (1898), pp. 179 ff.), Leitzmann (*Messe u. Herrenmahl* (1926), p. 211 f., and most recently J. M. Creed (in his *Commentary* on Luke xxii. 15–20, with references there given).

[2] *Syr. Cur.* omits *v.* 20 and both *Syr. Cur.* and *Syr. Sin.* transpose *vv.* 17 and 18 after *v.* 19. "Thus no genuine Old Latin MS. and neither *Syr. Cur.* nor *Syr. Sin.* has a text that speaks of two cups." Burkitt (*J.T.S.*, 1927, p. 179).

[3] Their omission is advocated by such scholars as Blass, Wellhausen, E. Meyer. It is favoured by H. N. Bate (*J.T.S.*, 1927, pp. 362–368).

Gospel would contain no account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and it would be easier to understand why in the allusions to the "breaking of the bread" throughout the Lucan writings (both the Gospel and Acts) there is no hint of any connexion between this fellowship-meal and the Last Supper. On the whole, then, it is simplest to suppose that the original text as it left S. Luke's hand, consisted of *vv.* 15–18, immediately followed by *v.* 21. The adoption of this conclusion, however, does not entirely dispose of the text of Codex Bezae (D) and its allies,[1] the "Western" text as it is commonly called: *vv.* 15–19a, followed by *v.* 21. Even if this text be the work of a scribe, it is the work of a scribe who probably had access to a certain amount of genuinely early tradition.[2] According to the tradition followed by this scribe the drinking of the cup preceded the eating of the bread. And this is the order[3] given in the *Didache*; it is the order in which S. Paul refers to the two in 1 Cor. x. 16; and it is, so to speak, the natural Jewish order.

Further, this tradition knows nothing of the wine as representing[4] Christ's blood, but only of the bread as representing Christ's body. And this goes far to remove a great difficulty, the difficulty to which Klausner refers when he writes "The drinking of blood, even if it was meant symbolically, could only have aroused horror in the minds of such simple Galilaean Jews."[5] The tradition which lies behind the text of D in Luke xxii. 15–20 must therefore be taken seriously.

Others are against it, e.g. Lietzmann and Creed. They think that Luke was following Mark, and though treating Mark with considerable freedom would not have gone so far (especially in view of the usage of the Church) as to omit all reference to the breaking of the bread. In that case it may be that S. Luke's change in order was due, partly at least, to his identification of the cup with the cup which usually began the passover meal. With this cup he associated the eschatological saying which he records, and so the words "This is my blood" simply dropped out because no room (or no suitable room) seemed to be left for them. This omission has the effect of emphasising the bread and the words "This is my body" (*cf.* Lietzmann, *op. cit.* pp. 215–17).

[1] I.e. apart from the MSS. already mentioned which insert *v.* 19a after *v.* 16—an obvious attempt to harmonise the account with that of the other Gospels.

[2] The interest of some of the peculiar readings of D both in the Gospels and in the Acts is well known.

[3] *Cf. infra, p.* 43 f.

[4] *Cf. infra, p.* 14.

[5] *Jesus of Nazareth* (Eng. tr.), p. 329.

Thus we shall need five columns to represent the early traditions about the institution of the Lord's Supper: one for S. Matthew, one for S. Mark, one for S. Luke's original text, one for the text reproduced by the scribe of D, one for S. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23–25). But as we have provisionally accepted the conclusion that the original text of S. Luke contains (like the Fourth Gospel) no account of the Institution at all we may dispense with the third column altogether.

Before we finally leave S. Luke himself, however, two points must be observed: (1) If S. Luke's original account includes the drinking of a cup of wine, but not the institution of the Lord's Supper, may it not be because actually the original institution did not include a reference to the cup, and what Christ said was only "This is my body," and not "This is my blood"? (2) The words "With desire I desired (i.e. I very earnestly desired) to eat this passover with you," as originally spoken by our Lord, may have referred not to the meal upon the table, but to the approaching passover meal, due the following evening.[1] According to this interpretation, what the Lord said was that He had desired to eat the passover that year, but was conscious of a premonition that His desire would remain unfulfilled; and the saying becomes another indication that the Last Supper was not itself the passover meal.

But to return to our columns. We are left with four, as follows:—

(*See Inset.*)

A comparison of the first two columns leads to the conclusion that S. Matthew, as so often, is simply reproducing S. Mark's account. Here the reproduction is largely word for word. We note especially the change in both Gospels from εὐλογήσας for "blessing" the bread to εὐχαριστήσας for "blessing" the cup. In verse 26 S. Matthew adds the word "eat"; in verse 27, where S. Mark has "and they all drank of it," S. Matthew has "drink ye all of it"; in verse 28 the two accounts have different prepositions in the Greek translated "for"[1] in the English (as used here there is only the slightest shade of difference in meaning between the two); and lastly, S. Matthew adds the phrase "unto remission of sins," interpretative words expressing the universal belief as to the purpose of the shedding of the Lord's blood. Thus we have no reason to suppose that S. Matthew had any other source at his disposal than S. Mark.

---

[1] So Burkitt, Brooke (*J.T.S.*, ix. (1908), 569–72), Kennett (*The Last Supper*, p. 34). This indeed may have been the original sense of the words even though S. Luke himself took them to refer to the meal then present as the passover meal. That S. Luke took them so is highly probable, for, as the words stand, the Lord says that He will not eat the passover "until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," and then refuses Himself to drink from the cup which S. Luke perhaps regards as the cup which (according to Mishna, *Pes.* x. 1, 2) begins the passover meal (the first of four cups of wine).

When we compare the third column with the second, we see that the two are, as literary documents, independent; but they plainly belong to the same stream of tradition. S. Paul uses in connexion with the bread the word for *giving thanks* (εὐχαριστήσας) which S. Mark uses in connexion with the cup. S. Paul does not explicitly say that the Lord gave the bread to His disciples or that they took it, though his account, no doubt, implies so much. S. Paul, finally, is the sole authority in the New Testament for the words "This do in remembrance of me[2] . . . this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

Full weight must be given to the apostle's claim that the tradition which he handed on to the Corinthians is a tradition which he himself had received, and which he believed to have come ultimately from the Lord Himself. Moreover, although there were distinct differences between S. Paul and many of the Jewish Christians in Palestine, there is no trace of any dispute on this point. S. Paul's version of the tradition concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper was never, so far as we know, challenged by his contemporaries or by his seniors. Yet how shall we account for the absence of the words "This do in remembrance of me" from the other accounts of the Last Supper, above all from S. Mark's?

We need not doubt that the early Christians were entirely justified in their conviction that it was right for them to repeat the Supper "in order to recall the Lord to mind"; but we are left in some uncertainty as to what were the exact words that actually fell from the lips of Christ—as to the exact words we ourselves should have actually heard with our own ears if we had been present. Do the accounts positively vouch for more than the minimum, viz.: "that the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body?" These words represent the highest common factor in S. Mark, S. Matthew, S. Paul, and D. They are therefore the best authenticated words.

---

[1] Mark ὑπὲρ, Matt. περί.

[2] The first of these two clauses is interpolated into the text of S. Luke in most of the Greek MSS.—all except the "Western."

In order, then, to build on the surest foundations, and solely on the surest foundations, in attempting to understand the thought of our Lord Himself, we shall, in the first instance, confine our study to this sentence alone: "He took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body." That is to say we shall not assume that the use of the wine was at all parallel to the use of the bread[1] or that after saying grace the Lord, in breaking the loaf, uttered more words than the four[2]: This is my Body.

WHAT OUR LORD MEANT.

The question we must reverently put to ourselves at this point is what was in our Lord's own mind when He spoke thus?

Though, as we have already seen, the meal in the Upper Room was not actually the passover meal, it is evident that the Lord had the passover in mind.[3] Now passover was still one of the most dramatic of Jewish festivals. In the time of our Lord it was not, perhaps quite so dramatic as it had once been. The regulations given in the Mishna, which appear to go back at least to the first century A.D., when the Temple at Jerusalem was still standing, distinguish between the passover celebrated in Egypt (i.e. as described in Exod. xii.) and that observed by later generations.[4] For example, instead of eating standing and in haste it was now ordered that " even the meanest in Israel shall not eat until they have arranged themselves in proper order at ease round the table."[1]

---

[1] According to D the disciples and not the Lord Himself drank from a cup at the beginning of the meal; presumably a kind of *Kiddush* cup. S. Luke, who, if our reconstruction of his original text be accepted, does not refer to the institution of the Lord's Supper, does mention the drinking of this cup.

[2] In Aramaic three words (*dēn hū gūphī*), Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

[3] Note especially the saying recorded in S. Luke, "I earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffered," Luke xxii. 15 (retained by D): a saying undoubtedly authentic (note the following verse, v. 16).

[4] *Pesachim*, ix. 5.

The dramatic element, however, was by no means lost. The Mishna[2] makes it incumbent "on every person, in all ages, that he should consider as though he had personally gone forth from Egypt, as it is said, "and thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did for me in Egypt."[3]

The occasion itself, therefore, was one specially appropriate for dramatic action. We remember how much and how often the great prophets of the Old Testament made use not only of parables, but also of symbolic actions. Isaiah gave his son the name of Maher-shalal-hash-baz (viii. 3), and walked barefoot (xx. 2f.); Jeremiah broke a potter's earthen bottle (xix. 10), and wore a yoke (xxviii. 10). Most varied and elaborate of all is Ezekiel's use of symbol and emblem. As an example we may refer to the series of four symbols given in Ezek. iv. and v. : followed by an explanation beginning with the words: "Thus saith the Lord God: This is Jerusalem . . ." (iv. 5)—that is, of course, "This represents Jerusalem."

It is not surprising, therefore, that our Lord, who in His teaching had made such use of parables, on this evening, the evening preceding the day when the passover lambs were to be slain in the Temple, should also make use of symbolic action. He took one of the flat loaves provided for the meal, and having pronounced the usual benediction over it, He broke it, saying "This is my Body": that, surely, is to say, "This represents my Body."[4] It would not have occurred to a Jew that Christ meant anything else but this. No material thing was ever to the Jew in itself a vehicle of spiritual grace. "The Jews," says Dr. Gore, "regarded their sacred rites as divine commands, elements in a covenant of God of which they were the subjects. They were circumcised because it had been so commanded, that they might remain within the covenant, into which as Jews they were born. They offered sacrifices because they were the divinely appointed means for maintaining or renewing their good relations with Jehovah. But they did not regard them as instruments of spiritual grace."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*, x. 1. [2] *Ibid*, x. 5. [3] Exod. xii. 27.

[4] *Cf.* Gal. iv. 24 "these women *are* two covenants," i.e., of course, "represent two covenants."

So here the disciples would certainly not have thought of the bread as no longer bread. It was still bread, broken bread, representing the Body of their Master, Who by His action had conveyed to them that His Body too must be broken in order that the purpose of God might be fulfilled.

According to the Gospel narratives, Jesus had for some time had a premonition of His approaching death. After S. Peter's great confession at Cæsarea Philippi, S. Mark represents the Lord as warning His disciples of it again and again.[2] The subject was evidently much in His mind. If so, with the knowledge of the Old Testament that such a religious teacher would naturally have had, must not His thoughts have often turned to the great unknown sufferer of Isaiah liii.?

> "He was despised, and rejected of men, . . . Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows . . . he was wounded for our transgressions . . . bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. . . . the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself and opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb; yea, he opened not his mouth. By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living? for the transgression of my people was he stricken. . . . It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin."

The suffering was vicarious and not in vain:

> "The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand, he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many: and he shall bear their iniquities."

---

[1] *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 92.

[2] viii., 31, 32; ix. 31; x. 32–34, 45 (and parallels). *Cf*. Mark ii. 20; x. 38; xii. 1–12.

Triumph and victory at last:

> "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

The only actual quotation from this passage recorded of our Lord in the Gospels occurs in Luke xxii. 37: "For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with the transgressors" (Isa. liii. 12). But the influence of the passage may with great probability be detected in Mark x. 45: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Here "for many"[1] seems to be due to a reminiscence of Isa. liii., 11, 12: "My servant shall justify many" . . . "He bore the sin of *many*." Apart altogether from such traces, however, the probability that, when our Lord had come to the conclusion that He must suffer, His thought would have turned again and again to so relevant a section of Holy Scripture, is, in view of the knowledge which He must have had of the Old Testament, overwhelming.

Here we may note especially the phrase about the lamb—"as a lamb that is led to the slaughter" (*v.* 7). The word "lamb" here in the LXX *πρόβατον*, is the same as the word for "lamb" in the regulation for the passover (Exod. xii 3). It is true that the passover victim could still in our Lord's day (as from the first) be taken either from the sheep or from the goats; but the evidence seems to indicate that in the first century A.D. it was more usual to choose a lamb than a kid.[2] At all events a large number of the animals brought to Jerusalem to be slain at the feast must have been lambs. Jesus must have seen them. May we not, must we not, suppose that He felt sorry for them? Poor, little, pitiful things.

If so, with the image of the passover lambs destined to be slain next day before His eyes and with the words of Is. liii. 7 at the back of His mind, was He not, as we should say, in just such a psychological condition as might naturally give rise to the symbolic action and words recorded of Him in the Gospels? As the bodies of the lambs would next day be left lifeless in the Temple, so His body too would be left lifeless; and He broke the loaf and said "This represents what is about to happen to Me: *this is My body*."

---

[1] *Cf.* Mark xiv. 24 (quoted above). *Cf.* H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of the Servant*, p. 69.

[2] *Cf.* G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, p. 345f.

The idea that a martyr's death might have a mysterious efficacy was by no means a new idea among the Jews. It had been developed particularly in connexion with the memory of the Maccabean martyrs. In IV Macc. vi. 27–29 the sufferings of these martyrs are regarded as vicarious, and as an expiation of the nation's sins. Thus "when the fire already reached to his bones, and he was about to give up the ghost," the aged Eleazar is said to have "lifted up his eyes to God and said 'Thou, O God, knowest that though I might save myself, I am dying by fiery torments for thy Law. Be merciful unto thy people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction in their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my soul to ransom their souls'." Similarly in xvii. 22 the writer sums up as follows: "Through the blood of these righteous men and the propitiation of their death,[1] the divine providence delivered Israel that before was evil entreated."

IV Maccabees is probably the work of a contemporary of our Lord who lived in Egypt. That our Lord had read the work is not to be thought of, but the quotation may serve to illustrate what were probably widespread ideas concerning the efficacy of martyrdom.

All the evidence at our disposal goes to show that, at all events by the last evening before the Crucifixion, our Lord had come to believe that His own death was necessary before the Kingdom of God could come. We may now sum up the investigation of this section as follows:—

The reconstruction of the Last Supper which is least assailable on the evidence at present available is that based first on Luke xxii. 14–18, which describes how at the beginning of the meal our Lord said grace over a cup of wine, and did not drink Himself or refer to Himself in any way at all except in saying "Take this, and divide among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come"; so that in connexion with the cup our Lord's language was distinctly eschatological; and secondly on 1 Cor. xi. 24a and Mark xiv. 22—"He took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, This is my body."

---

[1] *τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου θανάτου αὐτῶν.* Thus martyrdom was held to be a kind of sacrifice. As to the sacrificial character of the paschal lamb, *cf.* G. B. Gray, *op cit.*, p. 375. The lamb was solemnly slain in the Temple, its fat offered on the altar, and its blood poured away at the base of the altar. It was therefore a sacrificial victim, although it was not eaten within the Temple precincts. The lamb was, in point of fact, slain by the person who presented it; and Philo, in a very interesting passage (*De Decal.* 30), insists that by this act the layman one day in each year becomes a priest: "On this day the whole nation sacrifices without waiting for their priests, the law having granted to the whole nation for one day in each year a priesthood to attend to sacrifices." *Cf. De vita Mos.* iii. 29.

According to this re-construction the main intention in the mind of our Lord was a two-fold intention; first to encourage in His disciples the hope of the coming of the Kingdom; and second to bring home to them the fact that His own death was, in the mysterious purpose of God, necessary before the Kingdom could come. So much, I think, may be regarded as certain. Beyond this all is somewhat doubtful, and it would be unwise to count too much on any particular detail.

The Next Stage.

The next stage is that implied, rather than described, in the early chapters of the Acts. The fellowship-meals of our Lord with His disciples are continued in meals of which the leading characteristic is a joyous family feeling. How far or how often these meals included a reference to the Last Supper we do not know. Eucharists containing no such reference long survived, at all events in certain districts, as the evidence of the *Didache* seems to show.[1]

We are left to conjecture, and we may conjecture somewhat as follows. On certain occasions, probably the greater and more solemn occasions, and when wine was provided as well as bread, something may have been said to connect the drinking of the wine with a joyful anticipation of the coming of God's Kingdom when the Lord who, it might have been recalled, had refused to drink at the Last Supper, would again drink with His disciples; and reference may also have been made to the Lord's symbolic action and the words "This is my body," uttered at the "breaking of the bread."

---

[1] In some of the earliest paintings in the Christian catacombs at Rome our Lord is represented as sitting at table with His disciples as if at the Last Supper, but the food provided consists of loaves and fishes, and great baskets stand beside the table already filled with bread. *Cf.* J. Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*, taf. 15, 41 (2nd c. A.D.). In one of the pictures in taf. 15 there also seems to be a small cup upon the table.

Soon the Gospel reached Antioch, and at Antioch before long it was preached to Gentiles as well as Jews. In the meantime there would be the natural tendency to emphasise, at least on certain occasions, the religious character of the Christian fellowship-meal. Some special significance would be sought in the wine as well as in the bread. The current phrase "flesh and blood"[1] might readily be found suggestive. It was an easy step to take the wine as representing the Lord's blood; not indeed a step that would have been natural to a Jew, but a step not difficult to imagine in a cosmopolitan community like the Christian community at Antioch.

Further, the converted Gentile would be apt to take the Christian meal as a kind of funerary banquet, the purpose of which was to bind together those who remained faithful to the memory of Him who had gone. Stress would be laid in such circles on the memorial character of the meal. And we must not forget the prophets, the Christian prophets (Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1). In much later days, as the *Didache* bears witness, prophets were allowed to give thanks (*εὐχαριστεῖν*, *Did*. x. 7) in whatever words they wished. The prophets felt themselves to be imbued with divine inspiration and so authorised to speak. And as they sometimes spoke of the future, so, no doubt, they also sometimes spoke of the past. All the Christians felt that in continuing to celebrate the Lord's Supper they were acting under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ. Was it then a prophet who first made explicit what everyone felt to be implicit in the Christian tradition; and, in what he felt to be a moment of inspiration, first uttered the words "This do in remembrance of me"?[1]

---

[1] Ecclus. xiv. 18; Matt. xvi. 17, etc., and frequently in rabbinic writings. *Cf*. Strack and Billerbeck on Matt. xvi. 17. When the word "blood" became used in connexion with the wine there would still be no tendency to substitute the word "flesh" (*σάρξ*) for the word "body" (*σῶμα*) in connection with the bread because of the unpleasant associations the former word had, for many people at least (including S. Paul, Rom. vii. 18, etc.). *Cf*. Gifford, *Romans*, pp. 48–52.

And lastly, the wine having been thought of as representing Christ's blood, it would not be long before some application would be made of the idea contained in the familiar phrase "the blood of the covenant" (Exod. xxiv. 8). Certainly the phrase itself was early embodied in the Christian tradition (Mark xiv. 24, Matt. xxvi. 28, 1 Cor. xi. 25), although it may have been left for S. Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews to work out its full significance in this connexion.

Such is the development which, it may be conjectured, gradually took place at Antioch. In circumstances like these, development, though gradual and hardly realised, is not necessarily slow. The space of time involved need not be long. The fact that during this period Antioch maintained close relations with Jerusalem (Acts xi. 19, 22ff., 27 ff., xii. 25) will help to explain why such a development did not rouse any serious opposition in the Mother Church. Relations with Antioch did become strained over the question of circumcision (Acts xv.), but anything like an open breach was avoided by the conference at Jerusalem. This indeed, may be the real significance of this conference, to which S. Luke himself evidently attaches immense importance. It was not in any sense an œcumenical council; it was simply a conference by means of which Antioch and Jerusalem were held together, and so successfully held together, that no serious question arose over such matters as the observance of the Lord's Supper. Now we must remember that it was at Antioch that S. Paul began his first considerable period of regular missionary work—"a whole year" (Acts xi. 26)—in association with S. Barnabas. And so we come back to S. Paul.

---

[1] The so called *Odes of Solomon* furnish us with striking examples of the language of a Christian prophet-poet who in moments of ecstacy appears to lose his own individuality and become self-identified with his Lord. "I have been united to Him, for the Lover has found the Beloved," . . . This is the Spirit of the Lord, which doth not lie, which teacheth the sons of men to know His ways" (*Ode* 3). Thus in *Ode* 10 he seems to feel that he is simply opening his mouth for Christ to speak through him: "I was strengthened and made mighty, and took the world captive." In *Ode* 15 there is a similar "transition of personality" (J. Rendel Harris): "Death hath been destroyed before my face: and Sheol hath been abolished by my word": so also in *Ode* 17 and 42, and *Cf. Ode* 28, 3.

THE INTERPRETATION OF S. PAUL.

The material which S. Paul is working on, according to the reconstruction we are following, is the tradition with regard to the Lord's Supper current in the Church at Antioch just before the middle of the first century A.D. What does S. Paul make of this material? He has left us no systematic exposition of it in his surviving letters, and we must do the best with the fragmentary evidence at our disposal.

S. Paul felt himself called to be the apostle of the Gentiles, and he was much too alert and observant a missionary not to see the value of this Christian rite for the Gentile convert. If the burden of his preaching was, as he himself declared, "Christ crucified" (1 Cor. i. 22), the rite dramatised his message. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup," he says, "ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." (xi. 26.) The Lord's Supper was for S. Paul a sacred drama.

A sacred drama had long been for many religious people among the Gentiles a religious ceremony of great importance. Most famous of all was that performed at Eleusis near Athens in connection with the worship of Demeter. Only the initiated were admitted to the sacred rites, and these were accordingly known as "Mysteries" (i.e. secrets). So secret indeed were they kept that we still do not know the details. It would appear, however, that the initiates took part in a drama which set forth the story of Demeter and her daughter Persephone, who, it will be remembered, was carried off by Pluto and restored to her mother on condition that she spent one part of the year in the regions below and one part on earth. The myth was originally, no doubt, a nature myth representing the withdrawal of nature's productive power during the winter, and its return in spring. But the drama had long been interpreted as a drama of death and resurrection, inspiring those who took part in it with the hope of immortality.

The "Mysteries" of Eleusis were the most august and celebrated so far as the Greek-speaking peoples were concerned, but there were others; and later, in the second and third centuries, they were to become the most serious rivals of Christianity. They are all of the same general type. In them all the votary, becoming initiated after preparation and ritual purification, takes part in a drama which recapitulates the experience of the god, the lord of the particular cult; and they are all gods who have died and come to life again. By taking part in the drama the initiate becomes conscious of intimate spiritual relationship with his god. He too dies and rises again, and takes the experience to be a promise and a foretaste of a blessed immortality.

There is no reason to suppose that S. Paul was attracted by any of the pagan "Mysteries." He is much more likely to have regarded them, like his older contemporary, Philo of Alexandria, as "mere clap-trap and buffoonery."[1] Still, the Lord's supper was to him a sacred drama, and as such he saw that it appealed to his Gentile converts. It was a drama very moving in its simplicity, showing the Lord's death; and the Christians would go on showing the Lord's death as long as this age, the present order of things, lasted. The Lord would come again; and this age, this order of things, would pass away. Thus the drama preserves the eschatological reference of the Last Supper; the banquet is, from one point of view, a banquet anticipatory of, and in honour of, the coming of God's kingdom.

It is, of course, still for S. Paul a meal of Christian fellowship, and the first count on which he reproves the Corinthians is that they, by their selfish behaviour, are breaking the fellowship. But above all it is a "showing" of Christ's death—Christ's death which for S. Paul meant so much. It meant everything to him, he would have said; and it was his profound conviction that it meant everything to the world. As the covenant made by God with Israel was inaugurated with the shedding of the blood, so the shedding of Christ's blood inaugurated the new covenant, the new covenant between God and His new people, the new Israel, the new commonwealth of those who (whether by birth Jew or Gentile) *believed*.

We are now living, S. Paul would have said, in a new dispensation in which there is no room for anything evil. He himself used the Jewish observance of the Feast of the Unleavened Bread as an illustration. On the day before the passover, every Jewish house is purged completely of

[1] *De spec. leg.* I. 319.

leaven, so that no particle may remain when the passover lamb is sacrificed and the festival begins. Our passover has been sacrificed, S. Paul says (1 Cor. v. 7), Christ has been sacrificed. The festival period has been inaugurated—"wherefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

It is not surprising that S. Paul should have set a high value on the observance of the Lord's Supper. The observance brought home to the individual a personal realisation of the love of Christ: "the Son of God who loved *me*, and gave himself up for *me*." (Gal. ii. 20.) Each person who received a portion of broken bread, and who drank of the cup was thereby taught the personal appropriation of something provided by Christ. Such appropriation must, of course, be *by faith*. Faith for S. Paul is fundamental, and fundamental everywhere. No action of any kind either in the course of the Lord's Supper or anywhere else would have the least value for him if it were unaccompanied by faith.

Further, the Lord's Supper brings Christians into fellowship with one another on the highest plane of their lives. The communion is communion with one another in Christ. So that great scholar, W. G. Rutherford, translates 1 Cor x. 16, 17, thus: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not that whereby we have communion with each other in the blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not that whereby we have communion with each other in the body of Christ? As the loaf is one loaf, so we the many partakers, are one body; for we share, all of us, in the one loaf, from which the portion of each is broken."

In short, the Lord's Supper is a drama, a drama of intense power through its extreme simplicity and directness, gathered into so small a compass, *showing* in so brief a space the Lord's death and the thankful acceptance by each individual of all that that death means, and of the unspeakable love that led Him to die—to give Himself, as each can say, *for me;* an acceptance which brings all those who accept into the closest fellowship, making them all crumbs of one loaf, members of one family, limbs of one body. Such a drama must necessarily be kept together as a whole: and S. Paul always keeps it so. Undue stress on any one element or at any one point would destroy the balance and jeopardise the unity.

Picture the apostle presiding[1] at a celebration of the Lord's Supper at Corinth. It begins as a meal, a supper; it is the Lord's Supper, and, though the apostle is presiding, the Lord is the real host, the disciples are gathered at the Lord's table (I Cor. x. 21). Recent discovery has thrown light on the meaning of this expression—the Lord's table. Among the Oxyrhynchus papyri there have been found the actual invitations sent by one friend to another to dinner "at the table of Serapis in the Serapeum."[2] Thus Chæremon entertains his friend as a man would entertain a friend in a hotel; but instead of being in a hotel the meal is in the temple of Serapis, and so, being under the auspices of the god, the meal was in a certain sense a sacred meal. The table was the table of Serapis; Serapis was the host. But that fact did not in any way detract from the social character of the entertainment.

Similarly the Lord's Supper was a supper at which the Lord was the host; and so the gathering was religious and sacred. But none the less it was a social gathering. S. Paul would emphasise its social character while at the same time laying stress on the religious aspect of it. It should be less a hunger-satisfying meal and more an occasion for the enjoyment of "the fellowship of the Spirit."[3] "If any man is hungry, let him eat at home" (I Cor. xi. 34).

The drama proper begins at some point in the meal, probably towards the end.[1] The president, representing the unseen Host, takes a loaf, and, having said grace, breaks it into pieces and distributes them to all present; and similarly all after him drink of a cup of wine. This is done, he explains, in remembrance, in order to recall the Lord to mind, and he would briefly recount, very likely in the actual words given in 1 Cor. xi. 23–25, what had happened at the Last Supper.

---

[1] "There is nothing in the New Testament which gives any indication as to who might or who might not preside at the Eucharist." Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 139. Clement of Rome seems to assume that the president is the presbyter-bishop (xliv.). Ignatius (*Smyr.* viii.) says "let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it" (*ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ*). As Dr. Headlam points out (*C.Q.R.* Ap. 1930, p. 113), he does not say "a properly ordained presbyter." At a considerably later date Tertullian asserts that, in the absence of a presbyter, a layman could celebrate the Eucharist. *De Exh. Cast.* 7.

[2] Grenfell and Hunt, *Ox. Pap.* Nos. 110 and 523. On S. Paul's reference to "the cup of daemonia" and the "table of daemonia," *cf.* A. D. Nock in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson), p. 134.

[3] Phil. ii. 1. On the relation between the Agape and the Eucharist, *cf.* Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. ii, sect. i, p. 313f.; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 194f.; Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 197f.

That any words of his, or indeed, any prayer of his, should have produced such a change in the bread and in the wine as to make them to be bread and wine no longer must have been far from the apostle's thought. A Jewish mind would not look for such a change. The objects used in Jewish rites were not regarded as possessing inherent virtue apart from and independent of their context. The passover lamb, for instance, was eaten as part of the passover meal, but it was not held that the flesh carried in itself any spiritual gift.

On the other hand, S. Paul certainly regarded the bread and the wine, when consecrated to represent the body and blood of the Lord, as sacred, to be handled and received with reverence. To use a modern phrase, they had become "numinous" objects; not "numinous,"[2] however, in their own right; "numinous" because of their connection with the Divine Lord. The coin stamped with the portrait of the Emperor, or his statue, offers a partial parallel. Because of their connexion with the ruler of the Empire the coin and the statue are to be treated with respect. But at the fall of an unpopular emperor his coins might be defaced and his statues disfigured.[1]

---

[1] Note "after supper" (v. 25). Leitzmann (*op. cit.*, p. 228) points out that this would be in accordance with the procedure usual at the meals taken together by circles of friends (*Chaburoth*) at Jewish festivals. He refers to *Talm.* jer. Ber. 10d, bab. Ber. 43a, Tos. Ber. iv. 8 and to Ber. vi. 6 (*Mishna*). According to the last passage when wine was brought during the meal, each person said grace for himself, but over the wine brought at the end of the meal one said grace for all. Leitzmann, indeed, argues that both in the Pauline Churches and also at the Last Supper itself the blessing of the bread took place at the beginning, and the blessing of the cup at the end, with the meal itself between the two (*op. cit*, p. 228). But although the rabbinic sources must be taken into account, and it is striking that the present Jewish custom of having *two* loaves at the *Kiddush* ceremony can be traced to the third century A.D., Leitzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 206), their evidence is hard to evaluate, and it is difficult to judge how far it is applicable to the problems under discussion in this essay.

[2] R. Otto, *Das Heilige*, *passim*.

It is worth noticing that S. Paul never actually speaks of eating the Lord's *body*, but always of eating the *bread;* never of drinking the Lord's *blood*, but always of drinking the *wine*. Those who so eat and drink, faith of course—as always—being assumed, "are partakers of the Lord's body and blood." Exactly this distinction of expression is preserved by Cranmer in the English Book of Common Prayer.

In point of fact, there were at Corinth two tendencies, both dangerous. One was the tendency with which S. Paul deals in 1 Cor. xi., the tendency to eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord "unworthily." As to this S. Paul writes as follows: "As often as you eat of this bread and drink of this cup, you rehearse the Lord's death—until he come. Wherefore everyone who shall eat of the bread, or drink of the cup of the Lord as if to do so were an act not differing from any other, shall be held responsible in respect of the body and the blood of the Lord. Let a man scrutinise his own motives, and then, not before, let him eat his portion of the loaf and drink from the cup. For he who eats and drinks, eats and drinks judgment against himself, if the body he discern not. This is the reason why many among you are ill and infirm, and why quite a number have died."[2]

The whole attitude of the Christians here referred to was unsatisfactory, and in connexion with the Lord's Supper their irreverence came to a head. It was at this point that S. Paul felt he could best deal with it. Disrespect to the Bread and to the Cup meant disrespect to the Lord whose emblems in a very special sense they were. It implied that very attitude of contempt and carelessness which had been responsible for His crucifixion.

It is evident that S. Paul regards participation in the Lord's Supper as a peak point in Christian experience and that he would encourage the Corinthians to regard it as such. It was a salutary exercise, an effective means of promoting spiritual health, for them to ascend such hills of the Lord. Such ascents were a high privilege, and should be prepared for with the utmost care. Lack of preparation and the consequent lack of the health-promoting experience were responsible for the low state of vitality among some of the Christians at Corinth. Their bodily health itself had been affected; some were ill and infirm, and quite a number had died.

---

[1] Thus, for example, we find the portrait and legend of Geta obliterated on coins of Blaundos in Lydia (similarly Domitian on copper coins of Cibyra; for Nero *cf. Zeitschr. f. Numismatik*, Bd. 34 (1924), pp. 354, 355: *cf.* also *Z. f. Num.* (1925), p. 201; (1922), p. 168; (1904), p. 144; *Num. Chron.* (1898), p. 304; R. Mowat in *Rev. Numis.* (1901), p. 443 f., Dio Cassius records the destruction of Caligula's statue (lx. 22; *cf.* lxxvii., 12); and so on.

[2] Tr. W. G. Rutherford.

It must be admitted that the closeness with which S. Paul connects these deaths at Corinth with this particular act of disrespect is somewhat surprising. We must, however, remember that, although, as we have already seen, sacramentalism proper did not enter into Judaism, the Jews had very strong notions as to the sacredness of certain objects set apart for religious purposes. Such objects could not convey grace, but God required them to be treated with respect. So here S. Paul may be regarding the offence of the Corinthians as an extreme instance of disrespect towards objects which God required to be held sacred, as having been consecrated for a holy use.

Further, we must be careful not to press S. Paul's language too far. It may contain an element akin to Synecdoche, the figure of speech which mentions a part instead of the whole. S. Paul may really have had in mind the whole attitude of these offenders to spiritual things, the general carelessness and contemptuousness of which the treatment of the Bread and the Wine at the Lord's Supper was a particularly disgraceful expression.

But we may admit that S. Paul does lay great stress on the reverent use which must be made of the Bread itself and of the Wine itself.[1] We may admit that 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, implies the application to them of the terms "spiritual food" (πνευματικὸν βρῶμα) and "spiritual drink" (πνευματικὸν πόμα). It is clear, however, from this very passage that, even when there is no question of improper reception, such spiritual food and drink do not of themselves secure the right spiritual condition of their recipients. S. Paul is here using the story of the Israelites in the wilderness as an allegory to show that people may partake of spiritual food and drink, and yet be in a most unsatisfactory spiritual condition. They may be under God's displeasure, and indeed they may be on the point of being "overthrown." The Apostle is thinking of the second of the tendencies at Corinth which he wishes to check; the danger of trusting merely to the bare act of receiving the sacred elements without regard to the moral and spiritual character of those who receive. What S. Paul says in effect is this: that however much Christians may see in the Lord's Supper—and S. Paul encourages them to see much in it—they must look carefully, putting themselves in the best possible condition, and using all their powers; and what they see must be controlled by their knowledge of the Moral Character of God.

---

[1] Widespread among the early Christians was a keen sense of the newness of their life in Christ. Nothing was too wonderful to happen. God might use material things in quite new ways. Stories were told, for instance, of handkerchiefs or aprons carried from S. Paul's body to the sick and of diseases consequently departing from them (Acts xix. 12).

Before we finally leave S. Paul and pass on to the rest of the New Testament we must notice another aspect of the subject which is latent rather than expressed in his teaching. If the Lord's Supper is the drama, the showing of the Lord's death, then the Apostle's whole doctrine of the Atonement has a bearing upon his conception of what is shown. "Christ died for our sins" (1 Cor. xv. 3). God, the Supreme Governor of the Universe, could not, in forgiving our sins, merely overlook them. Damage had been done, and the damage must be repaired. Sacrifice was required, even the Sacrifice of Christ. S. Paul can never forget the sufferings of Christ on our behalf (2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 20), and he feels that, in enduring the sufferings which they are called upon to endure, the Christians have fellowship in Christ's sufferings. He goes so far as to speak of himself as filling up "that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church" (Col. i. 20). Thus, sufferings endured in Christ's name for the furtherance of His work on earth are linked with His. In the Lord's Supper "the breaking of the bread" typifies the breaking of the Lord's body. And S. Paul exhorts us to offer our bodies: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. xii. 1).

It is surely legitimate, therefore, to see in the drama the showing, first and foremost of the sufferings of Christ, and also, second and linked with His, the sufferings of those who have "presented their bodies a living sacrifice." From this point of view those who receive the elements pledge themselves to a share in the sacrifice and the suffering. This thought is brought out in a striking manner in the English Book of Common Prayer. After receiving the bread and the wine, and feeding on Christ in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving, we are taught in the Post-Communion Prayer to offer ourselves: "and here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee."

Mr. G. F. Bradby catches the thought in his two verses, entitled "Do This."

"Do This."

I give my body for your sake;
If needs must be,
Your bodies also you must break
In memory of me.

I give my blood, in pain and bitter loss;
You, too, must spill
Your life-blood, if I call you from the Cross
To do my Father's will.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

The next New Testament document we must consider is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some of the older commentators find a reference to the Lord's Supper in xiii. 10: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." But this view has been largely abandoned by recent scholars. So, for example, Professor Nairne writes as follows: "As his (i.e. the writer's) doctrine of the priesthood is larger than that special application of it, so the altar of which he speaks in xiii. 10, is neither the Cross nor the Lord's Table, but, if the phrase be allowed, the whole altar of life."[1]

We must be careful not to isolate the passage from its context. The writer has just said that "it is good that the heart be stablished by grace; not by meats, wherein they that occupied themselves were not profited." He goes on to say that eating does not come into the worship of Christians as it used to come into worship under the Old Testament dispensation. Christian sacrifice is typified in the Old Testament by a sacrifice no part of which was eaten (*vv.* 10–14). Christian sacrifice consists of thanksgiving offered through Christ, the doing of good, and charity (*vv.* 15, 16). Indeed it is rather striking to note how complete the omission of any reference to the Lord's Supper in this passage is. A similar though less noticeable omission may perhaps be discovered earlier in the Epistle. Considering how much the writer makes of Melchizedek, it is a little remarkable that he does not refer to Gen. xiv. 18a[1], though he quotes Gen. xiv. 18b.

---

[1] *The Epistle of Priesthood*, p. 156.

But though there is no definite reference to the Lord's Supper in the Epistle, the writer's conception of the Atonement is important for the development of Christian thought in connexion with it. The writer is very much of a Platonist and believes in an eternal order, which, though unseen, is alone real. Things seen and temporal are but as shadows compared with the reality of the unseen eternal world. The sacrifice of Christ belongs to the eternal order. Christ "through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God" (ix. 14). His offering is an eternal offering (x. 12), His high priesthood is an eternal high-priesthood (vii. 17), and the redemption effected by Him an eternal redemption (ix. 12).

From this point of view the sacrifice of Calvary represents the emergence on the plane of time and space, of something that is really timeless and eternal. Are we not bound now to say "the *supreme* emergence" and to see other emergencies in "our lesser Calvaries"? John Arkwright in the hymn that moves the heart every Armistice Day strikes a true note when he links the sacrifice of those who gave "all they hoped for, all they had," with the sacrifice of Christ.

> Proudly you gathered, rank on rank to war,
> As who had heard God's message from afar;

---

[1] "And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine."

All you had hoped for, all you had, you gave
To save mankind—yourselves you scorned to save.

Splendid you passed, the great surrender made
Into that light that never more shall fade;
Deep your contentment in that blest abode,
Who wait the last clear trumpet-call of God.

Long years ago, as earth lay dark and still,
Rose a loud cry upon a lonely hill,
While in the frailty of our human clay.
Christ, our Redeemer, passed the self-same way.

Still stands His Cross from that dread hour to this
Like some bright star above the dark abyss;
Still, through the veil, the Victor's pitying eyes
Look down to bless our lesser Calvaries.

These were His servants, in His steps they trod,
Following through death the martyr'd Son of God.

From this point of view the Lord's Supper presents the sublime Tragedy, the abiding Tragedy, of Life and Death and Suffering; the perpetual conflict between Good and Evil; the triumph of the Good ever renewing itself at terrible cost. And as we contemplate the Tragedy, as we ourselves take part in presenting it in the Lord's Supper, we realise something of the greatness and glory of the struggle. We are brought face to face with Fundamental Mystery. Anything petty in behaviour or ceremonial is altogether to be avoided. It is not a question of the transformation of the carbohydrates which compose wheaten bread into anything else. If they were so transformed it is difficult to see that such a transformation would have any value at all for religion; it would be a mere portent.

The mystery before which we bow is the mystery of the whole creation groaning and travailing together in pain until now. On the one hand Life with all its possibilities; on the other, Pain, Suffering—dark, dark, dark; and Death, the enemy, the last enemy. A sunset in an awful storm. Life battling, battling, shot through and through with agony; sinking, sinking, in the pains of death. But not in vain; no, not in vain. All the suffering of all who suffer in order to help others; all the self-sacrifice of every mother for her children, of every man who loves his country or his comrade, or the Cause he has embraced—all have a redemptive quality, all are part of the Eternal Redemption whereby God Almighty is redeeming the world. At the Lord's Table we hear that Song of Honour that Ralph Hodgson heard when he "climbed the hill as light fell short."

I climbed a hill as light fell short
And rooks came home in scramble sort

. . . .

It seemed so still the valleys were,
As if the whole world knelt in prayer,
Save me, and me alone.

. . . .

Then there came to his ears the great "hymn of being."

I heard the hymn of being sound
From every well of honour found
In human sense and soul.
The song of all both high and low
To some blest vision true,
The song of beggars when they throw
The crust of pity all men owe
To hungry sparrows in the snow,
Old beggars hungry too—

. . . . . .

The song of courage heart and will
And gladness in a fight,
Of men who face a hopeless hill
With sparking and delight,
The bells and bells of song that ring
Round banners of a cause or king
From armies bleeding white—

. . . . . .

Dog-loyalties to faith and friend,
And loves like Ruth's of old no end,
And intermission none—

. . . . . .

And burst on burst for beauty and
For numbers not behind,
From men whose love of motherland
Is like a dog's for one dear hand,
Sole, selfless, boundless, blind—
And song of some with hearts beside
For men and sorrows far and wide,
Who watch the world with pity and pride
And warm to all mankind—

That is what we hear as we gather at the Table of the Lord, to that we say "Amen."

I heard it all, I heard the whole
Harmonious hymn of being roll
Up through the chapel of my soul
And at the altar die,
And in the awful quiet then
Myself I heard, Amen, Amen,
Amen I heard me cry!

And that "Amen" commits us each to a ready acceptance of our own part, the part we are called to play, in the eternal purpose of God. Our "Amen" means, being interpreted, "Thy Will be done."

O Thou, who at thy Eucharist did'st pray
That all Thy Church might be for ever one,
Grant us at every Eucharist to say
With longing soul and heart, "Thy will be done."
Oh, may we all one Bread, one Body be,
One through this Sacrament of Unity.

S. John's Gospel.

Last of all we come to the Fourth Gospel, its author a very great and dear Father in God who lived at Ephesus and was revered by the Christians for miles around, at the beginning of the second century A.D. The Lord's Supper was by this time a long-established institution; and there was no need for S. John to repeat the history of its origin. The teaching of S. Paul and men like S. Paul had had great influence. We no longer hear of crude abuses like those described in 1 Cor. xi. But dangers are not yet over. Christians had been pondering over the Lord's Supper, and seeing more and more in it. And that was good, so long as their thinking was done thoroughly, with their whole powers, and in constant remembrance of the character of God.

But, as we have already seen, even in S. Paul's day there were some who argued loosely and fell into serious error. They came to regard the mere consumption of the bread and the wine, the mere receiving of the elements into the mouth and into the body as having in itself sufficient virtue; and to neglect their own spiritual and moral condition.

S. Paul had had sternly to remind them that a mechanical performance of this kind was by no means sufficient of itself to secure God's approval and God's blessing.

The Apostle's rebuke of unseemly behaviour in the service itself seems to have had the desired effect. The Lord's Supper had rapidly become less of a meal in the ordinary sense, and more of a religious service as it is now. But his warning against a mechanical view of the effects of receiving the elements had all too often been neglected or forgotten.

We gather from the writings of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (martyred in 120) that by the beginning of the second century A.D., many Christians in Asia Minor had gone considerably beyond S. Paul in identifying the bread itself in some mysterious way with the flesh of Christ. The "Eucharist," writes Ignatius, "is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, which also the Father of his goodness raised up."[1] In justice to Ignatius himself it should be added that he probably did not intend that his language should be tied down to its literal meaning. Elsewhere he speaks of the Gospel as the "flesh of Jesus,"[2] faith as the "flesh of Christ,"[3] and love as "His blood."[4]

But other Christians were not so enlightened, and some of them had come to attribute a kind of automatic action to the consecrated bread itself and to the consecrated wine itself, apart from the spiritual apprehension in and the spiritual condition of the recipient. In writing his Gospel, S. John had such Christians in mind. In the sixth chapter their language about the Eucharist is deliberately accepted, but accepted in order to carry the reader beyond the words themselves, beyond the rite itself, to the inward and personal knowledge with Christ which the rite at once symbolises and mediates. The chapter, read carefully and as a whole, shows that feeding upon Christ is a bigger and wider thing than merely the receiving of the eucharistic bread and wine. In order to appreciate this fact it is necessary to examine the various paragraphs in their context.

The first fourteen verses of the chapter recount the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and this incident suggests[5]

[1] *Smyrn*, vii. [2] *Philad*, v. [3] *Trall*. viii. [4] *Rom*. vii.

[5] Note the word for "having given thanks" (*v.* 11) εὐχαριστήσας.

the subject of the discourse to the multitude "on the morrow" (*v.* 22) which begins in *v.* 26, and leads to our Lord's statement (*v.* 32), "Verily, verily I say unto you, it was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven, and giveth life unto the world. They said therefore unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life." And then our Lord continues "he that cometh to me" (not "he that eateth me") "shall not hunger," "he that believeth on me" (not "he that drinketh of my blood") "shall never thirst." This explains the figure of eating, as S. Augustine recognised in that famous phrase of his, *Crede et manducasti*—"Believe and thou hast eaten."

The statement "I am the bread of life" (*v.* 35) is, of course, parallel to several others in this Gospel: "I am the light of the world" (viii. 12), "I am the door" (x. 9), "I am the good shepherd" (x. 11), "I am the vine" (xv. 5).

We find nothing like the language of Ignatius till we reach *v.* 51 "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." "The bread which I will give is my flesh" here is Ignatian language at last. Its difficulty is admitted by recording the objection raised by the Jews. But the Ignatian phraseology is only repeated and emphasised *vv.* 53–58:

> "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me. This is the bread which came down out of heaven; not as the fathers did eat, and died; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

At last the disciples themselves protest: "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (*v.* 60). The answer to them follows (*vv.* 61, 62): "Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before." This seems to take up the implied incredulity with regard to the bread "coming down from heaven"; but the words have a wider application—"You must be prepared for things hard to understand—"[1] and open the way to what follows: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life. But there are some of you that believe not" (*vv.* 63, 64). Here surely the meaning is: "You must not take all this about eating and drinking as referring to literal eating and drinking with the mouth; the life-giving force is the spirit; and the sayings of the Word made flesh—they are spirit and they are life."[2]

Thus, while the phraseology of Ignatius is admitted, its proper meaning and application are insisted upon. S. Augustine catches the thought of the passage when he writes: "This is the eating of that food and the drinking of that drink, for a man to dwell in Christ and to have Christ in him dwelling; which thing is nothing else but to be in the love of Christ."[3] And this accords with the Lord's whole teaching. No formal loyalty, no observance or rite, however beautiful or sacred, was ever for one moment placed by Him on the same level as Judgment and the Love of God.[4] "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."[5] "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?"[6] To put among the first of His commands "Carry out this rite" is to do dishonour to His memory. Not such was the mind of Christ; not so have we learned of Him. It is not without significance that in the Fourth Gospel the place of the story of the institution of the Lord's Supper is taken by instruction and prayer. Instead of the Cup we have the Vine, in Whom we are to abide and so abiding to bear much fruit (xv.).

---

[1] *Cf.* iii. 12.

[2] *Cf.* J. M. Creed, *Sacraments in the Fourth Gospel* (*Modern Churchman*, Oct. 1926), and especially p. 369: "We seem to find a similar attitude towards the sacrament of Baptism in the discourse with Nicodemus. There is the same unqualified statement of the Church's faith: 'Amen, Amen, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But the words which follow dwell upon the unseen operations of the spirit"—the reference to the water being quietly dropped.

[3] Quoted by Bishop Jewel, *Works* (Parker Soc.), I, pp. 212, 213. *Cf.* also *Tract. in Joan* xxvi. 18; and Origen, *Hom. in Num.* xvi: "We are said to drink the blood of Christ, not only in the use of the Sacraments, but also when we receive his words."

[4] Luke xi. 42.

[5] Matt. vii. 21.

[6] Luke xii. 57.

But, as we have seen, S. John is far from denying the value of the Lord's Supper as an observance to be maintained in the Church of Christ. He will use the liturgical language which had become current in connexion with it. All he desires to do, and he desires this most earnestly, is to keep the interpretation of it on a high spiritual level. The observance is a means to an end, not an end in itself. It is a means by the proper use of which that loyalty and devotion to the Lord is promoted and encouraged which finds its real proof in a dedicated life. "If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (xiv. 23).

EPILOGUE.

Very briefly we may gather up the main results of our inquiry. First of all it is clear that the details of the original institution of the Lord's Supper and of the subsequent history of its observance in the earliest times are far from certain. It would be most unwise to base anything that we regard as fundamental for our religion upon uncertain details of this kind. Indeed it is plain—the evidence, in the providence of God, being so scanty—that we are not intended to do so.

In the absence of certain information, therefore, we may well in practice adhere to the tradition of our Church as it has come down to us. Happily in the Book of Common Prayer we have—and we owe it under God to Archbishop Cranmer—what is surely the best Liturgy, the best form of service for the Holy Communion, in the whole of Christendom. It is certainly the form most patient of interpretation in the light of modern study and research. And as S. John was content to retain the eucharistic language of his time so long as its interpretation was maintained at a high spiritual level, so may we be.

If, however, we really wish in our observance of the Lord's Supper to get back, as far as possible, to the Upper Room, then the results of our enquiry would seem to indicate the following modifications.

The Cup should be taken separately. No such words as "This is My Blood" should be said over it, but only a simple grace; and it should be drunk in honour of the coming of the Kingdom of God. There would be no objection to the use of "individual cups." The grace would be said over the vessel from which the wine was poured into them.

There should follow in due course a Prayer of Consecration similar to the Prayer in our present (1662) Book, but containing no allusion to a cup and referring to the bread in some such words as these: "Who in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread and when he had given thanks, he brake it, saying, This is my Body."

If such a revision were to take place by universal consent it would be welcome; but in the meanwhile we may thankfully use the form Cranmer has given us. All things considered, and with due regard to its history and sacred associations, it is certainly by far the best form available at present. And in using it we shall do well always to bear in mind the Archbishop's own words: "Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law (as much of Moses' Law was), but it is a Religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit."[1]

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Anrich, G. *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum* (1894).
Bethune-Baker, J. F. *Early Traditions about Jesus* (1929).
Bousset, W. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (1926).
Cave, S. *The Gospel of St. Paul* (1928).
Creed, J. M. In *The Modern Churchman*, Oct., 1926.
Dalman, G. *Jesus-Jeshua* (Eng. tr., 1929).
Gardner, Alice. *History of Sacrament in Relation to Thought and Progress* (1921).
Gardner, Percy. *The Religious Experience of St. Paul* (1911).
Goguel, M. *L'Eucharistie des Origines a Justin Martyr* (1910).
Gray, G. Buchanan. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (1925).
Hunkin, J. W. *The Earliest Christian Church* (1929).
Klausner, J. *Jesus of Nazareth.* (Eng. tr., 1925.)

---

[1] *Of Ceremonies, Why some be Abolished and some Retained.*

LAKE, K. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (1911).
LIETZMANN, H. *Messe und Herrenmahl: eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie* (1926).
LOISY, A. F. *Les Mystères païens et le Mystère Chrétien.* (2nd ed., 1921.)
NOCK, A. D. In *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation.* Ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson (1928).
OESTERLEY, W. O. E. *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (1925).
PLUMER, A. *Lord's Supper.* (Hastings, *D. B.*, Volume III.)
SCOTT, C. A. ANDERSON. *Christianity According to St. Paul* (1927).
WEISS, J. *Das Urchristentum* (1917).

For a fuller list see G. H. C. MACGREGOR, *Eucharistic Origins* (1928).

II. FORMULATION OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE.

THE GREEK AND LATIN FATHERS

A. J. MACDONALD.

IN the study of the early history of doctrine the investigator is liable to read into his texts the thought of later epochs. In his article in the Hauck-Herzog *Realencyklopädie*[1] Loofs has shown the importance of this maxim for sacramental doctrine.[2] Yet caution may itself be a hindrance, and the effort to avoid perceiving what is not there may end in the refusal to see what is not convenient, and the criticism of an exuberant affirmation may end by becoming an equally misleading negation. The principle of the critical analysis is apt to be set up as a dogmatic theory. Loofs' principle, which declines to perceive the doctrine of the real presence, in the Catholic sense, in the teaching of the first five centuries of Christian history, is supported by the evidence of the Sub-Apostolic writers before Justin Martyr; but it becomes less and less admissible when applied to the writers from the time of Justin to that of Ambrose. While it is doubtful whether the pagan mystery religions encouraged the formulation of sacramental realism[3], allowance must be made for the influence of Gnostic docetism,[4] and the early appearance of realism is proved by the popularity of the eucharistic legends. Legends may be bad evidence for historical facts, but they are relevant for the history of ideas. Stories of physical manifestations of the flesh and blood of Christ on the altar could not have been composed unless inspired by a theory of the real presence, and unless they could be disseminated in minds which had already been prepared by that teaching. These stories appear at least as early as the time of Cyprian[5] (d. 258). The doctrine of the real presence of Christ within the eucharistic elements, was certainly taught during the patristic era, the debatable question is how soon did it enter the teaching of the church?

---

[1] I. 38 ff.

[2] So also Steitz, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, ix.–xiii.

[3] Hoffman, p. 246 f. Struckmann, p. 111 ff.; Réville, p. 166; Schubert, *Outlines of Church History* (Eng. trans. M. A. Canney, 1907), p. 130; Nock, pp. 124, 128, 136 ff., 139; Lowther Clarke, *New Test. Problems*, p. 176.

[4] Loofs, p. 43 f., allows for both.

[5] *De Lapsis*, 25 f.

The writings which have come down to us from the age succeeding that of the apostles are few, but they show a singular unanimity, both in what they include and in what they omit concerning eucharistic doctrine. The most striking omission before the time of Justin Martyr is that of the words of institution recorded in the synoptic gospels, and, in contrast, constant use is made of the Johannine teaching of the spiritual nourishment for eternal life supplied by the eucharistic food. Andersen,[1] Goguel,[2] Réville[3] and Loofs[4] have emphasised these characteristics of early sacramental teaching. Whether the omission of the words of institution was due to the fact that copies of the synoptic gospels were not yet widely disseminated,[5] or because they were read in their simple literal sense, as referring to a historic event in the life of Christ, without realist or sacrificial significance, or whether they were taken for granted by the early writers is no part of our task in this chapter to decide. The important fact is that neither the *Epistle* of Clement to the Corinthians, nor the *Didache*, nor Ignatius make any appeal to the *Hoc est corpus meum*, and consequently the most ancient proof-text of sacramental realism is missing from their doctrine.

The *Epistle* of Clement to the Corinthians (written *c.* 95) contains little that is important for the early history of eucharistic doctrine. Its significance lies rather in what it omits. Réville states that the dispute at Corinth, which called forth Clement's letter, was a controversy between the "bishops" and the Christian community concerning private eucharists.[6] The "bishops" were attempting to check the continuance of private eucharists conducted in the homes of the people, in favour of public eucharists in the churches, controlled by the bishops' supervision. Batiffol, with more probability, retorts that the question involved was not that of the Eucharist,[7] yet he maintains that the offerings made to God refer more properly to the Eucharist than to prayers or gifts for the poor, although, he admits, Clement's words will bear either of the two latter interpretations.[1] Goguel rules out prayers,[2] and inclines to eleemosynary offerings,[3] and while he thinks that the idea of sacrifice was present in Clement's mind, Clement did not expound it as a theory, and certainly not as a theory of sacrifice in the Eucharist.[4]

---

[1] P. 66. [2] Pp. 240 ff. [3] P. 56. [4] P. 39.

[5] On this problem *cf.* Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (1924), p. 12.

[6] P. 43. [7] P. 55.

In the midst of a long letter of mild rebuke against jealousy and disorder, and of gracious exhortation to repentance and obedience, Clement says "we ought to do all things in order, as many as the Master hath commanded us to perform, at their appointed seasons. Now the offerings and administrations (προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας) He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. . . . They, therefore, that make their offerings (ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν) at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed."[5]

What were these offerings? In the next chapter (41) Clement appears to give the answer. He continues the sequence of his ideas with the exhortation "Let each of you, brethren, in his own order give thanks to God (εὐχαριστείτω θεῷ) maintaining a good conscience and not transgressing the appointed rule of his service, but acting with all seemliness." No reference is made to bread or wine, to body or blood, nor is "This do" quoted as "the appointed rule of His service," still less as the Christian equivalent of administration (λειτουργία) or sacrifice (θυσία). Clement is giving directions for the regulated public worship of the church, he outlines the earliest form of worship of the Christian community, which of course included the sacramental meal, and it seems that he regarded it as a service or act of general thanksgiving to God. The offerings (πρόσφορα) are thanksgivings for "the gifts of God, dear beloved! Life in immortality, splendour in righteousness, truth in boldness, faith in confidence, temperance in sanctification! And all these things fall under our apprehension."[8] According to Swete the offerings are "the prayers and thanksgivings of the church, and the material offerings which symbolised the thankful rendering to God of His own gifts."[1]

---

[1] P. 54. [2] P. 226.

[3] P. 227, n. 1. So also Hatch *The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches* (1901), p. 40, n. 32.

[4] P. 226 f.

[5] Cap. 40, Harnack i. 209, n. 2, relates Clement's phrase with προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα. But this intensifying of the idea of sacrifice does not appear in the Epistle.

[6] Cap. 35.

Even the "thanksgivings" are not the primary object of Clement's instructions, but rather their orderly conduct on regulated occasions. For this purpose he draws a comparison (cap. 41) with the orderly Jewish sacrifices at Jerusalem, and this comparison alone suggests to him the phrase "Jesus Christ the High Priest of our offerings."[2] If a comparison between the agape or Christian sacramental meal and the Old Testament sacrifices had been the subject of his instruction, he could hardly have avoided the quotation "This do," or a pointed reference to "This is my body," as the equivalent of the Jewish sacrifices, as the content of the offerings (*πρόσφορα*) and the subject of the thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστείτω*).[3]

Rauschen, the Catholic writer, criticising Hehn[4] and Struckmann,[5] who also write from the Catholic standpoint, says that no appeal can be made to the *Didache* (written *c.* 100) for the doctrine of the real presence.[6] Rauschen is supported by the Protestant writers Loofs,[7] Goguel,[8] Andersen,[9] and Réville.[10] But the *Didache* contains definite instructions concerning the cup (*ποτήριον*) and the broken bread (*κλάσματος*),[11] which are the instruments of the thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*). The Eucharist is a fellowship-meal of thanksgiving sanctified by religion. "As touching the thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*) give ye thanks thus (*οὕτω εὐχαριστήσατε*) First as regards the cup: We give thee thanks O our Father, for the holy vine of Thy Son David which thou madest known unto us through Thy Son Jesus. . . . Then as regards the broken bread (*κλάσματος*): We give Thee thanks, O our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known unto us through Thy Son Jesus. . . . As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom. . . . But let no one eat or drink of your thanksgiving, but they who have been baptised into the name of the Lord."[1] "And after ye are satisfied thus give ye thanks: We give Thee thanks, Holy Father, for Thy Holy name . . . for creation, for spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Son. Before all things we give Thee thanks that Thou art powerful."[2]

---

[1] *J.T.S.*, iii. 164, following Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, ii. 134 f.

[2] Cap. 36. [3] *Cf.* Andersen, p. 62.

[4] *Die Einsetzung des heiligen Abendmahl* (1900), p. 172.

[5] P. 1 ff. [6] P. 2. [7] P. 39. [8] Pp. 234, 240.

[9] P. 59. But Andersen goes too far when he says that the *Didache* does not refer to the Eucharist. *Cf.* Nock, p. 130: "The *Didache* rite does not expressly refer to the Last Supper. Nevertheless, read with that in mind, it does not exclude a reference to it."

[10] P. 56. [11] *Cf.* S. John vi. 12 f., where the word appears.

The meal, although religious, is scarcely sacramental. While the term "thanksgiving" is applied to the whole proceeding, the "communio" is divided into the agape and an act of religious thanksgiving. The cup and the broken bread still form part of the agape. It is a "holy communion" of the baptised, not a Sacrament of the body and blood. The barest symbolism is associated with the cup and bread, the former symbolises the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy in the line of David[3]; the broken bread symbolises not the body of Jesus broken in sacrifice, but firstly the "life and knowledge"[4] imparted through the human life of Jesus, and secondly the unity of the Church, like the gathering of the sheaves of corn from the hillsides to make the bread now broken. The fraction symbolises not the sacrifice of a body, but the sharing by different members in the one communion. Unification springs from elements which are separate or broken. The true unity is a "communio" of the severed.

Réville[5] and Batiffol[6] from their different standpoints refuse to perceive a separation of the "communio" into two parts in the account of the *Didache*, and indeed if the division implies that the second part is to be emphasised as the Eucharist proper in the later sense, this objection is valid. Yet two stages in the "communio" appear to be in the writer's mind. "After ye are satisfied, then give ye thanks," and the distinction is enforced by the direction that "the prophets" are to be permitted to offer thanksgiving (εὐχαριστεῖν) as much as they desire.[1] But the thanksgiving is still general, and is not confined to the eucharistic food. That is included in the thanksgiving for creation, and natural food, and holy and adoring gratitude for God's power. The bread and cup—the *Didache* nowhere mentions wine—are not spoken of in the Thanksgiving proper, where the terms used are "food and drink," and their connection with the phrase "eternal life" shows that they are not used symbolically of the Last Supper, but with the general significance of eternal life revealed through Christ. No doubt the terminology of S. John vi. influenced the writer's phraseology, but Hoffmann[2] strains the statement by alleging that we have here the Ignatian "medicine of immortality."

---

[1] Cap. 9. [2] Cap. 10.

[3] Struckmann, p. 13, and Hoffmann, p. 220, perceive a reference here to the eucharistic blood in the chalice. Batiffol, p. 71, n. 2, sees rather the fruit of the blood of Christ—life—salvation—as an analogue of the life and knowledge indicated by the bread.

[4] Swete, p. 178, commenting on this passage, says: "In some quarters a disposition is shewn to spiritualise the words of institution so far as to obscure their reference to His actual flesh and blood." But Swete has not noticed that the words of institution are not used.

[5] P. 47. [6] P. 60f.

The religious character of this common meal or holy communion of thanksgiving is made clear by a double fencing of the feast. "Let no one eat or drink of your thanksgiving, but they that have been baptised in the name of the Lord," and "first confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no man having his dispute with his fellow, join your assembly until they have been reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled; for this sacrifice it is that was spoken of by the Lord 'in every place and at every time offer me a pure sacrifice.'"[3]

The Christian sacrifice (θυσία) as in the Epistle of Clement, is an act of thanksgiving—the offering of thanksgiving for gifts received from God.[4] The whole sacrificial notion is reversed. Man is not really the offerer, and God is not the recipient. The Christian thanks God for blessings received.

In the Ignatian epistles (written not later than 115) the Eucharist is still a fellowship-meal of thanksgiving, although the writer, like Clement, contends for its orderly observance, and enforces the necessity for episcopal supervision and sanction. "Let that be held a valid thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. . . . It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptise or to hold a love-feast (ἀγάπην ποιεῖν).[5] But for the first time the necessity for defending the Christian belief in the Incarnation against heretical attacks drives Ignatius to use language foreshadowing the adoption of the theory of the real presence in the Eucharist. The docetic Gnostics taught that the body of Jesus was one of appearance only. It *seemed* to be that of a man. Their theory of the evil nature of matter prevented them from allowing that the divine personal emanation of divinity, which appeared in Jesus, could be associated with a human body. Against this teaching Ignatius protests, and indicates that the practical results of the teaching of "those who hold strange doctrine touching the grace of Jesus Christ which came to us. . . . Have no care for love, none for the widow, none for the orphan, none for the afflicted, none for the prisoner, none for the hungry or thirsty. They abstain from thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*) and prayer, because they allow not that the thanksgiving is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised up."[1]

---

[1] Cap. 10. [2] P. 219. [3] Cap. 14. [4] *Cf.* Swete, p. 164. [5] *Smyrn.* 8.

The passage is of chief importance as an indication of the avenue along which sacramental realism first entered dogmatic phraseology. It was an attempt to meet heretical attack upon the humanity of Jesus. Its original object was not a positive attempt to supply a "real" content for eucharistic doctrine in imitation, perhaps, of the mystery religions. It was a negative defence against Gnosticism. The man Jesus was *not* a mere phantom or spiritual manifestation of divinity.[2] The same influence operated in the teaching of Irenaeus. Unfortunately for the whole future development of sacramental doctrine, the first defender of the Incarnation doctrine was a Syrian marching with hasty steps towards the baptism of martydom. To Syrian intensity of feeling was added the martyr's glowing hope of speedy union with the glorified Lord. Therefore his language throughout all these letters is vividly metaphorical and symbolical, couched in the terms of poetry rather than theology.[3] The idea of a real flesh of Jesus in the Eucharist is entirely foreign to Christian thought at the beginning of

[1] *Smyrn.* 6.

[2] On the influence of Gnostic docetism on orthodox eucharistic teaching *cf.* Hoffmann, pp. 166, 175 ff.; Andersen, p. 83.

[3] On the psychological temperament of Ignatius *cf.* Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (1919), pp. 165 ff.

the second century. It is foreign to the thought even of Ignatius, who used it in the letters to the Smyrnaeans and the Philadelphians. The Ignatian phraseology is symbolical.

The term "Eucharist" was not yet confined to the eucharistic elements.[1] They were not yet regarded in a sacramental sense. There was no consecration or dedication either by the use of the words of Jesus spoken at the Institution, or by an Epiclesis, or calling down of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine. In Ignatian thought the bread is faith and the cup is love,[2] symbolised by the food received at the fellowship meal, which provide protection against heresy. "Take ye only Christian food and abstain from strange herbage which is heresy, for these men (the heretics) do mingle poison with Jesus Christ . . . like persons administering a deadly drug with honied wine.[3] . . . Do ye therefore arm yourselves with gentleness in faith which is the flesh (*σὰρξ*) of the Lord, and in love which is the blood (*αἷμα*) of Jesus Christ."[4] Secondly, the bread and cup are a bond of Christian unity. "Abstain from noxious herbs, which are not the husbandry of Jesus Christ, because they are not the planting of the Father. . . . If any man walketh in strange doctrine he hath no fellowship with the Passion.[5] . . . Be ye careful, therefore, to observe one thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*) for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union.[6] Thirdly, the fellowship meal supplies an earnest of immortality and an antidote against death. The significance of the phrase "flesh of Jesus Christ," used in *Philadelphians* 4, is immediately indicated in the next passage: "taking refuge in the Gospel as the flesh of Jesus"[7] . . . the Gospel which "is the completion of immortality."[8] Herein lies also the interpretation of the Eucharist as an act symbolising unity and conveying eternal life. "Assemble yourselves together in common . . . breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality (*φάρμακον ἀθανασίας*) and antidote against death."[1] The *breaking* of the bread, not the bread itself, is the medicine of immortality,[2] and supplies the flesh of Christ, which in turn is the teaching or Gospel of Christ.[3] "The words that I say unto you they are spirit and they are life.[4] Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood ye have no life in you.[5] The bread that I will give is my flesh."[6] Clearly Ignatius has in mind the language of the Fourth Gospel, which he embodies in his more vivid terminology, not as a means of introducing the notion of the real presence into the Eucharist, but in the spiritual manner of S. John, where the "word" or teaching is symbolised under the terms "bread," "flesh," "blood."[7]

---

[1] *Cf.* Andersen, p. 76; but Swete, p. 163, thinks that the term originated in the thanksgivings or benedictions pronounced over the bread and cup. For early usages of the term *cf.* F. J. A. Hort (*Ibid*, p. 594 f.).

[2] *Trall.* 8. [3] *Trall.* 6. [4] *Trall.* 8. [5] *Philad.* 3.

[6] *Cf. Magn.* 1. I pray that there may be in them union of the flesh and of the spirit which are Jesus Christ . . . a union of faith and love; *Philad.* Intro. "which church I salute in the blood of Jesus Christ, that is eternal abiding and joy;" *Smyrn.* 1: "ye are established in faith immovable . . . being as it were nailed on the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, in flesh and in spirit firmly grounded in love in the blood of Christ." (*Cf.* Hoffman, p. 165.)

[7] *Philad.* 5. [8] *Philad.* 9.

But the symbolism of Ignatius is not bare. The symbolical procedure of the fellowship meal of thanksgiving produces a dynamic effect upon the participants. The teaching, symbolised by the bread and the cup, produces faith and love in the recipient, and mediates eternal life. The Ignatian epistles contain the first clear exposition of that dynamic symbolism which throughout the patristic era, the early middle ages and in the Reformation time, more adequately expresses the sacramental teaching of the New Testament than any other interpretation presented to the Church. At the same time the language of Ignatius not only heralded the approach of realist doctrine, but made use of terms which become fixed in the realist interpretation. No identification was made by Ignatius between the eucharistic bread and wine and the actual body and blood of Christ, but from Ambrose to Paschasius Radbert, and so through the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) to the Council of Trent, that identification was made in terms used by him: "The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised up."[1]

---

[1] *Eph.* 20.

[2] *Cf.* Andersen, p. 71f commenting on *ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες ὅ ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας* not *ὅς ἐστιν*. But Mr. McCubbin points out that *ὅ* may also refer to *ἄρτον* although grammatically attracted to *φάρμακον*.

[3] Andersen, p. 72, equates *ἕνα ἄρτον κλᾶν*=*φάρμακον ἀθανασίας* with *ἀγαπᾶν* in *Smyrn.* 7.

[4] S. John vi. 63. [5] S. John vi. 53. [6] S. John vi. 51.

[7] *Cf.* Steitz, ix. 427. But Steitz ix. 436, thinks that the language of the Fourth Gospel was first used by the Alexandrians.

During the first decade of the second century the Eucharist was still a fellowship-meal, comprising the agape and a formal thanksgiving after the meal was completed. Such gatherings, week by week, all over the Empire, could not fail to attract the attention of the Government, and Pliny's letter to Hadrian shows that steps were taken by the authorities in the province of Bithynia to prohibit these gatherings as assemblies dangerous to the public peace. Réville, with probability, concludes that the policy adopted by Trajan, and reflected in the letter of Pliny, resulted in the abandonment of the fellowship-meal, and in concentration upon the Eucharist or thanksgiving, which thus rapidly became a cultural rite, and the Eucharist assumed its purely ecclesiastical rôle as an act of worship,[2] although the agape still appears to have been in existence in Alexandria in the time of Clement.[3] Moreover, in large communities like Rome it became less and less possible to provide a fellowship-meal for the growing body of Christians, and so the necessities of the expanding Christian community contributed towards the gradual whittling down of the "communio" into the ecclesiastical Eucharist.[4]

By the time of Justin Martyr in the middle of the second century this process was complete. The agape or fellowship-meal had been displaced by a service of prayers, followed by the presentation of the bread and cup containing wine mingled with water (*ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος*) to the presiding minister (*προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν*) who rendered thanks abundantly (*εὐχαριστίαν . . . ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται*) to the Father in the name of the Son and Spirit for these benefits. When the people had said "Amen," they partook of the eucharistic bread, wine and water (*ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος*) which was also sent to the absent.[1]

---

[1] *Smyrn.* 6. Varied interpretations of Ignatius' doctrine have been given among non-Catholic writers. Rückert, pp. 301, 305, concludes that he says nothing definite; Loofs, p. 40: his teaching is not purely symbolical, but it cannot be shown that he conceived of an actual presence of the flesh and blood of Christ; Goguel, p. 250: a symbolical interpretation is not excluded, we cannot interpret literally all his expressions, yet (p. 255) he has a realist conception of the flesh of Christ; Hoffman, p. 179f.: an identity of the elements with the flesh and blood of Christ must have been impossible to Ignatius, but he uses the terms "body and blood"; Réville, p. 36: he does not say expressly that the bread is flesh and that the cup contains the blood of Christ. The Eucharist itself is called the flesh of Christ. The language of Ignatius is metaphorical; Andersen, p. 72: the flesh and blood of the Eucharist are not in his teaching. The Catholic writers interpret him in a realist sense.

[2] P. 30. [3] Bigg, pp. 136ff.; Bethune-Baker, pp. 406ff.

[4] *Cf.* Goguel, p. 272 and Th. Harnack *Der Christl. Gemeindegottesdienst* (1854), p. 25. Andersen, p. 85f. disputes this view, and maintains that the agape was still in use in the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. The close of the second and beginning of the third century have been suggested as the time when this change was made (*cf.* Lowther Clarke, p. 177. Dr. Clarke also describes Völker's theory which rejects the association of a social meal with the Eucharist in early days).

Two important developments appear in this passage. While the general thanksgiving for God's mercies in creation, natural sustenance and so on, which characterised the Eucharist in the *Didache*, is still preserved,[2] the main emphasis is laid on the thanksgiving for the bread and wine, and so closely is the thanksgiving associated with the elements, that they are designated by the same term, "This bread is called by us Eucharist" (*ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία*),[3] and only they who believe the truth of Christian teaching, and who have been baptised for the remission of sins and the new birth, and who live as Christ commanded were allowed to partake.[4] The Eucharist has lost its purely social character, and is a religious thanksgiving, a cultural rite,[5] an act of communion manifesting the unity of the Christian body, its purity of teaching, and obedience of life.

But the development did not stop here. "We do not take these things as common food and drink, but in the same way that Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God (*διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθείς*) had flesh and blood for our salvation, so we were taught the food over which thanks have been given (*εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν*) by the word of prayer which comes from Him (*δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ*)—food by which our blood and flesh by metabolism (*κατὰ μεταβολὴν*) are nourished—is both flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh (*ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα*)."[6] At length the doctrine of the real presence of Jesus in the Eucharist has appeared, although with a lofty spiritual significance, free from material notions; and Justin grounds his theory on the theological conception of the Incarnation, an idea which formed the basis of later teaching on the sacramental process or union between Christ and the elements. The eucharistic food is "flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh." But this statement does not include an identification of the consecrated bread and wine with the actual body and blood of Jesus.[1] Justin, like Ignatius, wrote in defence of the real manhood of Jesus against Gnostic docetism,[2] and he uses emphatic language of the "flesh" of that Jesus. His thought in contrast with his terminology is occupied rather with the agency of the Word[3] (Logos). As the Word was the agent of the Incarnation, so He is the agent of the eucharistic presence of the "flesh and blood."[4] If the eucharistic content is described as that same Jesus who formerly was made flesh, Loofs' interpretation of the teaching of Justin, as implying a union of the bread and wine, effected by the Logos with Himself, on the analogy of the Incarnation—an Assumption theory[5]—accords better with Justin's language than the interpretation of Harnack, who holds that Justin pre-supposed the identity, produced miraculously by the Logos, of the eucharistic bread and the body assumed at the Incarnation.[6] But Loofs' expression, "dynamic realism," seems artificial, a mere phrase to avoid admitting a real presence. Sacramental realism is dynamic *ipso facto*. "Dualism" expresses better the conception of Justin. Christ is present in the Eucharist, but His body and blood are not identical with the bread and wine.[7]

---

[1] *Apol.* i. 65–67.
[2] *Apol.* i. 67. ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα εὐλογοῦμεν. *Cf. Dial.* 41.
[3] *Apol.* i. 66. [4] *Apol.* i. 66.
[5] Réville, p. 13; Andersen, p. 84; Hoffman, p. 231; Goguel, p. 290.
[6] *Apol.* i. 66.

Two other important developments in the ecclesiastical formulation of the doctrine appear in the teaching of Justin. The bread and wine are consecrated by prayer *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου*,[8] and for the first time the words of institution are quoted as the authority for the performance of the Eucharist. "For the apostles, in the memoirs which they composed, and which are called Gospels, delivered that it was thus commanded them, that Jesus took bread and gave thanks, and said 'This do in remembrance of me. This is my body,' and that He likewise took the cup, and after He had given thanks said 'This is my blood,' and gave it only unto them."[1] The words of institution thus become the prayer of consecration, "the word of prayer that comes from Him," and they form the effective principle in the dedication or consecration of the bread and wine.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Rückert, pp. 398, 401.

[2] Andersen, p. 83.

[3] *Apol.* i. 33 appears to shew that λόγου θεοῦ here also means Logos.

[4] *Cf.* Goguel, p. 270; Hoffmann, p. 244. [5] P. 41. [6] Vol. I, 211 n.

[7] Steitz ix. 441 refuses to see the real presence in Justin's teaching.

[8] *Apol.* i. 66; *cf.* *Apol.* i. 13 λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας. Hoffmann, p. 243, sees an antithesis in *Apol.* i. 66 between the word of prayer and the Word of God. Swete, p. 170, n. 2, criticises the translation "word of prayer" given by Gore (*Body of Christ*, p. 289 f.; in favour of the word

But Justin does not teach a change of the elements into the body and blood[3] in a metabolist sense as Rückert contended.[4] He does not say that the food (τροφὴ) is made or converted into flesh and blood, but that after prayer it *is* the flesh and blood, that is to say, the spiritual presence of Jesus is associated with it on the analogy of the words *Hoc est corpus meum* . . . . He uses the term "metabolism" (κατὰ μεταβολὴν) merely to indicate the physical nourishment of our bodies by the bread and wine (τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν)[5] and spiritual nourishment[6] in the terms of S. John and Ignatius, as a pledge of the resurrection of the flesh. The emperor, Antoninus Pius, his imperial correspondent, would not have understood a statement which embodied the notion of physical realism.

Reference to the command received from Jesus appears also in three other passages. The word ποιεῖν used in each

---

which is invoked by the prayer of Christ. Bethune-Baker, p. 399, and Srawley, p. 547, have "prayer of the Word." But Gore is supported by Gwatkin, p. 53, Struckmann, p. 54, and Batiffol, p. 28. Steitz, ix. 432, says that εὐχαριστεῖν=consecrate.

[1] *Apol.* i. 66. [2] Struckmann, p. 55; Batiffol, p. 28.

[3] Loofs, p. 41; Hoffmann, p. 244; Rauschen, p. 27; Réville, p. 18, a change of value; Struckmann, pp. 56, 62 (but he holds that if Justin did not express the idea of the change, he indicated it). Batiffol, p. 31, n. 2, says more strongly that Justin "*n'a pas les termes, mais il a la chose.*"

[4] P. 397. [5] *Apol.* i. 66.

[6] Goguel, p. 272, thinks that the feeding could only have been symbolic in Justin's conception, on the ground that the bread and wine could not have provided a meal for a large congregation. Réville, p. 17, says that Justin spoke of feeding on the flesh and blood as a concession to apostolic tradition. The idea is foreign to the rest of his thought.

case does not signify "sacrifice," but "celebrate."[1] While in the first of these three passages (*Dial.* 41) Justin interprets the offering of the butter which was made on recovery from leprosy as a prefiguration (τύπος) of the bread of thanksgiving which our Saviour ordered us to celebrate, he describes the latter as a commemoration (ἀνάμνησις) and not as a repetition of His sufferings,[2] in order that we may render thanks to God for the creation of the world, for our delivery from the perversity in which we were born, and for the destruction of the powers of evil. In the second passage (*Dial.* 70) a statement of Isaiah is quoted as a prophecy of the celebration of the bread in memorial of the Incarnation and Passion, and as a prophecy of the celebration of the cup of thanksgiving in memorial of the shedding of His blood. That no sacrificial signficance is attached by Justin to the Eucharist in these quotations from the Old Testament is proved by the third passage (*Dial.* 117), in which he says that although God made known beforehand, through the medium of prophecy, all the sacrifices which Jesus ordered to be celebrated, that is to say all those in which thanksgiving for the bread and cup are offered by Christians in every part of the world, yet prayer and thanksgiving are the only sacrifices which are perfect and agreeable to God. These alone He commanded to be celebrated in the commemoration of their feeding both "dry and liquid" in which they commemorate the Passion. Yet if Justin does not include the notion of sacrifice in the Old Testament or pagan sense,[3] there can be little doubt that these statements foreshadowed the entry of sacrificial ideas into the doctrine of the Eucharist, and laid the foundation for the sacrifice of the Mass.[4] Several aspects of later realism can be deduced from his terminology if not from his thought, and later interpreters have not failed to make use of his name as a sanction also for metabolism, or the doctrine of the conversion of the elements.

---

[1] Réville, p. 8, n. 1; Goguel, p. 273. Harnack i. 209, n. 2, influenced by his general thesis of the early corruption of Christian doctrine by pagan accretions, equates ποιεῖν with θύειν, but admits that only the prayers are θυσία proper. The elements are only δῶρα, πρόσφορα, which obtain their value from the prayers.

[2] On the contrary, *cf.* Goguel, p. 245, though rather with emphasis on a repetition of the experiences of the Logos, than of the sufferings of the humanity.

[3] Harnack, i. 209, n. 2, on the contrary finds the "transaction of the supper as a sacrifice" not only in Justin but in the *Didache* and Ignatius. But even some modern Catholic writers dispute this view. *Cf.* Rauschen, p. 2 f.

[4] Hoffmann, p. 241 f., finds in Justin's teaching a symbolical dramatic representation of the sufferings of Christ pointing to the Mass, influenced by the dramatic tendency of the Greek spirit revealed in the tragedies.

Having indicated the genesis of realist terminology, if not of realist thought, in the middle of the second century, it will not be necessary to trace in detail the teaching of subsequent realist writers. The doctrine of the real presence definitely entered the Catholic dogmatic system in the anti-Gnostic writings of Irenaeus[1] (d. *c.* 200), which played a leading part in influencing the codification of this doctrine, but the theory of a conversion of the elements or sacramental metabolism does not yet occur. To the dualism of Irenaeus Cyprian (d. 258) added the conception of sacrifice, and from these two writers[2] the ideas of the real presence and of a sacrificial oblation were handed on to both eastern and western Christendom. Loofs[3] denies that realism, in the later sense, was taught by these writers, although he allows that Cyprian was influenced by the sacrificial idea. The critical examination of the significance of the word "sacramentum" in Cyprian's writings conducted by Poukens[4] lends support to Loofs' contention. Of seventy-one examples taken from Cyprian and his contemporaries, thirty-seven use the word "sacrament" in the sense of "symbol," and of these twenty-five are used by Cyprian. Even in the passages which relate especially to the Christian Sacraments the notion of "symbol" is by far the most frequent.[5]

Meanwhile the original interpretation of the Eucharist as a spiritual symbolic feeding, drawn from the Fourth Gospel, by which a dynamic influence is exerted on the life of the individual, was being taught by Tertullian (d. 210). Rückert was one of the first writers in modern times to stress the symbolism of Tertullian.[1] Harnack, misled by his thesis of the early perversion of Christian doctrine under Hellenic influences,[2] and readily seizing upon every opportunity to perceive the doctrine of the real presence in early Christian writings, gave wide currency to the researches of Leimbach, who attempted to prove that Tertullian's symbolism should be interpreted in the sense of the Greek term "mystery" (*μυστήριον*), and that "repraesentare," or "figura," when used by him signified the actual presence of that which they symbolised.[3] "At that time 'symbol' denoted a thing which in some kind of way, really is what it signifies,"[4] and this statement of Harnack has been widely adopted by Catholic writers,[5] without criticism of its manifest refusal to face the problem, comprised within the lame expression "in some kind of way," and has influenced English eucharistic thought through the writings of Gore.[6] But Loofs long ago showed the weakness of Leimbach's proofs,[7] and recently the critical study of the Catholic writer de Backer,[8] following von Soden[9] on the significance of "sacramentum" in Tertullian's works, lends support to Loofs,[10] and thus confirms Rückert's interpretation.

---

[1] *Cf.* especially *Hœr* iv. 18, 4–5; Rauschen, p. 28; Struckmann, pp. 63 ff., 70 ff. Some writers, e.g. Harnack i. 262, n. 5, hold that realism was directly derived from the sacramental cultus of some of the Gnostic churches, rather than inspired by emphasis on the humanity of Christ in the anti-Gnostic orthodox writers. Struckmann, pp. 111 ff. criticises this view. Steitz, ix. 450 f. says that Irenaeus teaches an ἔκκλησις and not an ἐπίκλησις of the word in the prayer of consecration. The first trace of the influence of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist is to be found in Irenaeus (p. 461), but Rückert, p. 418, assigns this development to Cyril of Jerusalem.

[2] Especially in *Epis.* LXIII.

[3] Pp. 48, 58.

[4] In De Ghellinck *Pour l'histoire du mot "Sacrament,"* i. 162 ff.

[5] *Ibid*, pp. 218 ff.

The Lutheran scholar Leimbach made an exhaustive enquiry into Tertullian's use of the words repraesentare, repraesentatio, censeri, census, figura and consecrare, and came to the conclusion that Tertullian's doctrine of the Eucharist was the impanation theory,[11] or the secretion of the body and blood of Christ in the elements after consecration—a form of sacramental dualism. "Repraesentare," according to Leimbach, has the significance of a real true presence; "repraesentatio" makes the absent present.[12] But of the 31 cases of Tertullian's usage of the word "repraesentare" quoted by Leimbach,[13] (not all of course in relation to the Eucharist), ten[1] can be shown to carry the modern significance of the word, meaning to reveal or stand in the place of something which is absent, or something contrasted with the object under discussion; and two cases are doubtful.[2] Even Leimbach admits that three, and possibly four of his quotations bear the modern interpretation.[3] Thus one-third of his texts, concerning the word “repraesentare,” appear to be contrary to his conclusion. Consequently, in the one passage in which Tertullian uses “repraesentare” of the Eucharist, in his work against the Gnostic Marcion, in which he says that the bread represents Christ’s body (*panem quo ipsum corpus meum repraesentat*)[4] there is no reason for concluding that Tertullian means the term to be interpreted in any other than a figurative sense.

---

[1] Pp. 305 ff.

[2] A criticism of this view appears in Hoffmann, p. 228 f.

[3] *Beiträge zur Abendmahlslehre Tertullians* (1874).

[4] II. 144; *cf.* 146.

[5] *Cf.* Struckmann, pp. 228 ff.; Batiffol, p. 204, n. 1.

[6] *Dissertations*, pp. 311 ff; *The Body of Christ*, p. 89.

[7] 59 f.

[8] *De Ghellinck*, pp. 62 ff.

[9] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xii (1911), 188 ff.

[10] The present writer came to the same conclusion concerning the invalidity of Leimbach's proofs before consulting Loofs and Backer.

[11] P. 96 f.

[12] P. 19.

[13] Pp. 11 ff.

Leimbach quotes seventeen cases of the use of “repraesentatio,”[5] but in three of these the representation is a contrast between one object and another,[6] and so has its modern significance, a usage which Leimbach himself admits Tertullian sometimes adopted.[7] None of these passages is concerned with the Eucharist. His criticism continues to weaken in dealing with the terms “censeri” and “census.” In a passage which treats of the union of the faithful in Christ, Tertullian quotes the words of institution *Hoc est corpus meum*, and says that the idea of “His (eucharistic) body may be attached to the bread” (*corpus ejus in pane censetur*). But the emphasis is not placed on the notion of a real presence, but on our spiritual union with Christ mediated by daily prayer and communion. By asking for daily bread we ask for continuance in Christ, and for the preservation of indivisibility from His body (*individuitatem a corpore ejus*). We are to understand the petition spiritually (*spiritaliter potius intelligamus*).[8]

Leimbach has to allow that Tertullian’s usage elsewhere of “censeri” and “census” makes it impossible to give the term here its juridical significance of “to be” (*esse*), yet he will not admit that this passage indicates that Tertullian's eucharistic teaching was symbolical[1] and contends that it is of great importance for the definition of Tertullian's doctrine in a realist sense.

---

[1] *Apol.* 15 and 16; *Ad. Nat.* i. 12, ii. 10; *De Pœnit*, 3; *De Spec.* 30; *Adv. Præsc. Hær.* 36; *De Bapt.* 16; *Adv. Prax.* 11; *De Monog.* 10; Swete, p. 173, n. 5 quotes several other passages in which the modern sense of “repraesentare” appears.

[2] *Apol.* 17; *Ad. Nat.* i. 16.

[3] P. 20.

[4] *Adv. Marc.* i. 14; *cf.* Leimbach, p. 30.

[5] Pp. 22 ff.

[6] *Adv. Prax.* 24; *De Resurr.* 23; *De Jej.* 13.

[7] P. 27.

[8] *De Orat.* 6.

Tertullian uses "figura" and its derivatives over one hundred and fifty times. Leimbach confines his enquiry to some of these passages.[2] In five of the cases selected by him the interpretation appears to go against him.[3] Three are concerned with the Eucharist. In the treatise against Marcion (iii. 19), after quoting a passage from Jeremiah, he continues "so indeed God also made known to you, calling bread His body, in order that you may even here understand Him *to have given the figure of His body to the bread*, whose body in past time He figured prophetically (*corporis sui figuram pani dedisse cujus corpus in panem prophetes figuravit*), the Lord Himself intending to interpret this Sacrament afterwards. The same statement occurs with almost identical phraseology in *Adv. Jud.* 11.[4] Even if "figura" is equivalent to χαρακτήρ rather than σχῆμα,[5] a contrast with that which is not present is indicated by the term. If Tertullian had conceived of an actually present body it is curious that he did not use a term which would have signified it clearly.

The meaning of "figura" in Tertullian's eucharistic terminology becomes clear when another passage in the same work against Marcion is examined (iv. 40). "He desired to fulfil the figure of the blood (*figuram sanguinis*) of His salvation. . . . He made (*fecit*) the bread taken and delivered to the disciples His body, saying 'This is My body,' that is, 'figure of My body'" (*id est figura corporis mei*). Then Tertullian's line of thought changes: "Indeed there could have been no figure without the actual body. Otherwise the matter is empty, that is a phantom. It is not possible to grasp a figure. Besides if He feigned (*finxit*) the bread as His body, then since His body was in truth wanting, He must have offered bread for us (on the cross). He would have pandered to the stupidity (*vanitas*) of Marcion if bread was crucified . . . so what He then wished the bread to signify (*significasse*) He declared sufficiently, *calling* His body bread."

---

[1] Pp. 39 ff., 54 ff. Mr. McCubbin supplies the following paraphrase: "The idea also of His (eucharistic) body is included in the word 'bread' as used in the Lord's Prayer; and the fact that we may so include it is evidenced by His saying 'This is my body'." He points out that "*panis*" in this passage cannot refer to physical bread whether eucharistic or other.

[2] P. 63.

[3] *Adv. Jud.* 9 and 10; *De Resurr.* 20; *Adv. Marc.* iii. 19 and iv. 40.

[4] Semmler and Neander regarded it as an interpolation (*cf.* Leimbach, p. 72).

[5] *Cf.* Turner, *J. T. S.*, vii. 596.

Quite clearly in the first section of this passage, which refers to the Eucharist, Tertullian explains the words *Hoc est corpus meum* as "This is a figure of My body"; he will not have the meaning "This *is* My body." Then his thought is transferred to the primary object of the passage—the refutation of Marcion's docetism. The bread could not have been used as a figure or symbol unless the body of Jesus on that occasion had been present. If the human body of Jesus had not been present, then the symbolism of the bread as body was fictitious, and bread, as the only material substance associated with His phantom presence must have suffered on the cross, and this would be tantamount to conceding Marcion's heresy, which denied that Christ had a physical body, and that it died on the cross. The terminology of the second passage, which is concerned with docetic Gnosticism, cannot be used to interpret the first section, which is related to the Eucharist. Leimbach interprets these passages as an attempt made by Tertullian to prove that what was figuratively foretold in the Old Testament was actually present in the New Testament record.

Leimbach quotes five instances of the usage of "consecrare,"[1] in which, he says, the term means "to conceal in," or "to cover in," but only two of these passages refer to the Eucharist. One of them (*De Anima*, 17) clearly has the sense of "dedicating," or "setting apart," as Leimbach admits: "The aroma of wine, which He consecrated as a memorial of His blood" (*in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit*). In the other passage (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 10) "consecrare"="figurare": "So now He represented (consecravit) His blood in the wine, who then represented (figuravit) the wine in the blood" (of the sacrifices). The old rhetorician makes an epigram, which is to be read in the light of *Ad. Nationes*, i. 10,[1] in which Loofs shows conclusively that "consecrare" is synonymous with "figurare," and he says that Leimbach reveals his prejudice when he equates "memoria" with "receptaculum" in *De Anima*, 17.[2] We ask, in addition, why, if Tertullian intended "consecrare" to mean "conceal in," he did not use "celare"?

---

[1] P. 92 f.

Equally emphatic is Loofs' criticism of the earlier parts of Leimbach's treatise. The two first arguments of Leimbach, based upon "repraesentare" and "censeri," "signify nothing," and "figura" means "a mode of representation" (*Darstellungsform*). "Leimbach's proof goes, and Tertullian is shown to be symbolical."[3]

The critical researches of the Catholic writers de Ghellinck, and de Backer, into the meaning of the word "sacramentum" in Tertullian's writings, published in 1924, have contributed further support for the conclusion that Tertullian's teaching is fundamentally symbolical. De Ghellinck,[4] quoting von Soden,[5] states that the radical meaning of "sacramentum" is not derived from "symbol" or "mystery," bearing the old Greek significance of that which it symbolises, but from the military oath, or compact to serve with the forces.[6] For this statement de Backer supplies the evidence. The examination of one hundred and thirty-four passages taken from Tertullian, shows that in eighty-four examples of the use of "sacramentum," the root idea is the military oath. In fifty examples the interpretation "mystery" is given, but in thirty-two of these the idea of "figure" or "symbol" in the modern sense predominates.[7] In only seven cases can "sacramentum" be certainly interpreted by the Greek term "*μυστήριον*."[8] The word is formed from the verb "sacrare," and the suffix "mentum," and reveals the idea of (a) consecration, (b) an object or victim consecrated, (c) the symbol of consecration.[9] De Backer claims that his work is supported by the investigations of de Gröne and Réville, and he reminds his readers that in 1911[1] he had refuted Pember,[2] who had contended that the word "sacrament" had been applied to the Christian Sacraments with the same sense as in the pagan mysteries—that of a mechanical ceremony capable of producing magical effects.

---

[1] Senex de Saturno, imberbis de Apolline, virgo de Diana figuratur et miles in Marte et in Vulcano faber ferri consecratur.

[2] P. 59. [3] P. 59. [4] P. 48.

[5] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xii. 200f. (1911).

[6] *Cf.* von Soden, p. 217.

[7] P. 143. Labacqz and de Ghellinck arrive at a similar conclusion; *Cf.* p. 311f.

[8] P. 144. [9] P. 144f.

A summary of the teaching of Tertullian may therefore still be given in the words of Rückert. What does Tertullian mean by saying that the bread of the Eucharist is called "figuram corporis Christi"?[3] He means that every figure indicates an actuality, but that the figure and the actuality which it represents are never present together.[4] At the Last Supper His body was actually present, but neither to the body did He give the form of bread, nor to the bread the form of His body, but the non-literal significance of His body.[5] Tertullian did not think of the bread and wine as possessing the form of Christ's body and blood, he placed the figure and the body of Christ over against each other.[6] That Tertullian's teaching contained the idea of sacrifice is not denied, but not in the later sense. He embodies the evangelic notion of all the faithful as priests, who offer their earthly gifts and spiritual oblations to God.[7] Loofs goes further, and sees in his teaching the figurative representation of the sufferings of Christ, and while refusing to admit that Tertullian conceives of the body of Christ really present as the sacramental content, and therefore as the "oblatio," Loofs holds that the germ of the sacrificial symbolism of Cyprian is to be found in Tertullian.[8] We may add that Tertullian's language is sometimes cast in realist terms, as when he says that "the flesh is fed by the body and blood of Christ in order that the soul may be nourished by God."[9] But this is only the vivid imagery employed by the old rhetor,[10] it has no place in his thought.

Meanwhile the sacrificial tendency in North African symbolism received a check in the teaching of the Christian Platonists of Alexandria. From this source sacramental symbolism received a dynamic reinforcement, which, as we shall see, appeared again and again in the early middle ages. The fundamental concept of Alexandrian eucharistic doctrine was that consecration produces in the elements a dynamic potency, or effectiveness, or value derived from the heavenly archetype of the material types or symbols. The archetype is the glorified body of Christ; the types or symbols are the consecrated bread and wine. Clement of Alexandria (d. before 216) describes the bread and wine mingled with water as an allegory,[1] and he uses a phrase reminiscent of Ignatius; the body is faith and the blood is hope, which is the life-blood of faith.[2] Clement's teaching is dominated by his idea of the Christian life as the process by which the divine knowledge (γνῶσις) is apprehended. "This is the flesh and blood of the Lord, the apprehension of the divine power and essence.[3] "The doctrine of the Lord which is very strong is called His blood."[4] "Knowledge is our reasonable food."[5] Bigg remarks, "the elements are a symbol, an instrument inasmuch as they are ordained by Christ Himself. . . . But the veil, though a holy thing because it belongs to the sanctuary, is not the mystery that it shrouds, the allegory is not the truth that it bodies forth."[6] It is improbable that Clement intended to convey the idea of a mysterious reality embodied in the elements.

---

[1] E. de Backer, *Sacramentum* (Louvain 1911), pp. 48 ff., 110 ff.

[2] G. H. Pember, *The Church, the Churches and the Mysteries* (1901), p. 467 f.

[3] P. 320. [4] P. 324. [5] P. 325. [6] Pp. 328, 331.

[7] P. 376 f. [8] P. 60; *cf.* p. 58. [9] *De Resurr.* 8.

[10] On Tertullian's rhetoric, *cf.* Adam, p. 11.

This vagueness of expression becomes more clear when we come to the teaching of Origen (d. 254).[7] The bread and wine are a type, a symbol of Christian teaching on which men feed. "For it was not that visible bread which He was holding in His hand, that God the Word called His body. His body was the word (i.e. which He spake), whereof the bread to be broken was a symbol (μυστήριον). Nor was it that visible cup which He called His blood. His blood was the word (i.e. which He spake) whereof the wine that was to be poured out was a symbol. . . . Why did He not say 'This is the bread of the New Testament,' as He said 'This is my blood of the New Testament'? Because the bread is the word of righteousness . . . but the wine is the word of the knowledge of Christ."[1]

---

[1] *Paed.* ii. 2 (Migne 8, 428C); i. 6. (M. 8, 305B and 296B.)

[2] *Paed.* i. 6 (M. 8,296B).

[3] *Strom.* v. 10 (M. 9,101A).

[4] *Adumb. in Ep. Joan.* i. (M. 9,735D).

[5] *Strom.* v. 11 (M. 9,105C.); v. 10 (M. 9,101A); i. 10 (M. 8,744A).

[6] Bigg, p. 142. On Clement's symbolism *cf.* also Rückert, pp. 337 ff.; Steitz, x. 71 ff.

[7] Rückert, pp. 340 ff.; Steitz, x. 78 ff.

Origen describes the eucharistic body as a typical and symbolical body (τυπικὸν καὶ συμβολικὸν σῶμα).[2] If the bread is called a Eucharist (εὐχαριστία) that is because it is a symbol (σύμβολον) of thanksgiving towards God.[3] Eating and drinking have nothing to do with the spiritual life,[4] whose only food is the Word, who is the living bread.[5] His meaning in *Contra Celsum* viii. 33, thus becomes clear. The bread is consecrated by prayer and becomes a body (σῶμα) which is holy and makes holy. In other words consecration gives to the sacramental elements the effectiveness of the word or teaching of Christ, which gives life, they now symbolise the teaching and produce a dynamic effect on the soul of the recipient. "We drink His blood when we receive His words in which life exists (*cum sermones ejus recipiemus, in quibus vita consistit*), and so when we use Apostles' words we shed their blood."[6]

Origen's symbolism appears to be consistent, yet Struckmann[7] contends that the absence of the Eucharist from the list of heresies with which Origen was charged in the period between his death in 254 and the Council of Constantinople (543) indicates that his sacramental teaching was orthodox. But the *lacuna* bears another and more probable interpretation. The Eastern Church had not yet made up its mind on the question of the Eucharist, and if it tolerated the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa and Chrysostom, it had not yet repudiated symbolism. Origen passed uncondemned on this point because his symbolical eucharistic teaching embodied the ancient tradition.

Preoccupation with the Arian controversy over the divinity of Christ left Athanasius (d. 373) little opportunity for an exposition of the Eucharist, and only passing references to it occur in his writings. Rückert[8] classifies him among the symbolists, but Loofs[1] thinks he was under the influence of Irenaeus. A later text, preserved by Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople in the sixth century, has been assigned to Athanasius,[2] in which it is said that the effect of consecration is to bring down the Word into the bread and cup so that they become the body and blood of Christ.[3] Similar teaching appears in Irenaeus.[4] But his sojourn at Alexandria suggests that if any one earlier writer influenced his thought it was Origen, and no doubt his description of the consecrated elements as spiritual food (τροφὴ πνευματικῶς) which is a pledge to eternal life (φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου)[5] reflects the teaching of the great Alexandrian. Elsewhere he says "We do not share in the body of a man, but receiving the body of the Word we are made divine"[6] (θεοποιούμεθα). It is doubtful whether his statement that the "spiritual food" is the flesh and blood which Christ possessed on the night before the Passion, which was spiritualised after the Resurrection, and is given by Him who is in heaven,[7] is to be interpreted save in the terms of this Alexandrian mysticism, or in those of the Johannine mysticism. He quotes John vi. 54.

---

[1] *In Matt. Series 85* (Migne 13, 1734B).

[2] *In Matt.* xi. 14 (M. 13, 952A).

[3] *Con. Celsum,* viii. 57 (M. 11, 1604A).

[4] *In Matt.* xi. 14 (M. 13, 952A); *In Luc. Hom.* xi. 11 (M. 13, 1828B ff.)

[5] *In Matt.* xi. 14 (M. 13, 952A).

[6] *In Numb. Hom.* xvii. 9 (M. 12, 701B); *cf. In Joh.* xxxii. 16 (M. 14, 810B f.).

[7] P. 142.

[8] Pp. 350, 353, also Steitz x. 97 ff.

During the fourth century the sacramental symbolism of Origen was prevalent throughout the east, possibly the result of his sojourn in Palestine and Cappadocia. We have already drawn attention to the realist interpretation of the term "symbol," which has been popularised by Harnack and Gore.[8] But in so far as the Greek terms symbol (σύμβολον) antitype (ἀντίτυπον) and similitude (ὁμοιότης) are synonyms of the Latin terms *figura* and *sacramentum*,[9] the same reinterpretation ought to be applied to them as to their Latin equivalents, although, so far, no thorough etymological examination has been concentrated upon them.

The use of the terms "symbol" and "antitype" in the sacramental teaching of the Greek Fathers, while indicating here and there a realist significance, appears to be more natural and cogent when read in the plain and literal sense. Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 338–340) represents Christ at the Last Supper, saying, "You must not think that the flesh in which I am clothed is the flesh of which I speak, and which you have to eat, nor are you to think that I order you to drink this material and corporal blood, for you know that My words are spirit and life . . . so that the words themselves and the discourses themselves are the flesh and blood, of which he who always partakes, as one fed on heavenly bread, will be a partner of heavenly life."[1] The words are almost a quotation from Origen. In the *Demonstratio Evangelica* Eusebius uses "symbol" as a synonym of "figura"; "He gave to His disciples the symbols (τὰ σύμβολα) of the divine dispensation, bidding them make the figure (τὴν εἰκόνα) of His own body."[2]

---

[1] P. 51.
[2] *Cf.* Batiffol, p. 321; Darwell Stone, i. 70. It was rejected by Steitz, x. 125.
[3] Migne, 86, 2401B.
[4] *Haer.* V. ii. 2, 3 (M. 7, 1124B ff.).
[5] *Ep. ad Serap.* iv. 19 (Migne 26, 668A).
[6] *Ep. ad Max.* 2 (M. 26, 1088B). *Cf. Festal Letters*, iv. 4 (M. 26, 1379A).
[7] *Ep. ad Serap*, iv. 19 (M. 26, 665B f.).
[8] *Supra*, p. 55. [9] Even Batiffol admits this (p. 389).

Similar Origenist language appears in the writings of two of the great Cappadocian Fathers. Basil (d. 1st January, 379) wrote under the influence of the allegorical language of S. John vi.[3] "We eat the flesh of Christ and we drink His blood, when, through the Incarnation and the spiritual life, we share in the Word and Wisdom. By the flesh and blood Christ indicates His mystical presence (ἐπιδημία), and the teaching on which the soul nourishes itself and prepares itself for the contemplation of things which really are."[4] Gregory of Nazienzus (d. 389) writes: "With a perfect purity of heart and without shadow of doubt, eat the body and drink the blood, if you desire life."[5] The consecrated elements are antitypes (ἀντίτυπα) of the precious body and blood, and the figures (τύποι) of salvation[6] "Antitype" here has the significance of "copy"; it excludes the notion of feeding on the actual body,[7] and this spiritual feeding appears in the *Homilies* of Macarius of Egypt (d. 390–391): "Bread and wine are offered, the antitype (ἀντίτυπον) of His flesh and blood," and those who receive "the visible bread spiritually eat the flesh of the Lord."[1] The Antiochenes Eustathius[2] (d. 337),[3] Epiphanius,[4] Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus (d. 403), and Theodoret (d. 457)[5] also use the terms "symbol" and "antitype" of the body and blood of Christ, when describing the elements.

---

[1] *De Eccles. Theol.* iii. 12 (Migne 24, 1021D f.).

[2] viii. 1 (M. 22, 596A); *cf.* i. 10 (*Ibid.* 91A f.) and *Hist. Eccles.* x. 3 (M. 20, 847B).

[3] Batiffol, p. 393, although he does not agree that the passage quoted refers to the Eucharist (p. 394).

[4] *Epis.* viii. 4. (Migne 32, 253B.) Steitz, x. 131 f. traces the earliest tendency towards Transubstantiation in Basil.

[5] *Orat.* xlv. 19. (M. 36, 649C.)

[6] *Orat.* viii. 18. (M. 35, 809D f.); xvii. 12 (*ibid.* 980 B.) Greg. of Naz. first uses the term ἀντίτυπα as a memorial feast of the sufferings of Christ (*cf.* Steitz, x. 141, 403).

[7] Loofs, p. 51.

More striking evidence of the widespread symbolism in the sacramental teaching of the Greek churches during this period is to be found in some of the sacramentaries or liturgical offices. In the *Sacramentary of Serapion* (*c.* 350), the correspondent of Athanasius, the Anaphora contains the prayer: "To thee we have offered this bread, the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of the body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of the holy body. . . . We also making the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of the death have offered the bread. . . . We have also offered the cup, the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of the blood."[6] It will be observed that he speaks of the offering of the bread and the cup, not body and blood, of which they are merely the likeness, and later on he equates the terms "body" and "blood" with "Word" and "Truth,"[7] in the Origenist sense. In the liturgical section of the Syrian *Apostolic Constitutions* (A.D. 350–400) the term "antitype" is applied to the "mysteries" and to the "Eucharist," but also to the elements, to which it primarily belongs. These are called antitypes of the precious blood and precious body of Jesus Christ.[8] In the Coptic *Egyptian Church Order* of the fifth century, the bread is the "figura"[9] of the flesh of Christ, and the ancient Latin version of this sacramentary translates the Coptic term by "exemplum" (and continues) "which the Greeks called antitype (*antitypum*) of the body of Christ; and the mixed chalice on account of the antitype which the Greek calls similitude (*similitudinem*) of the blood."[1] In the West, at the end of the fourth century, according to the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*,[2] the Roman liturgy appears to have described the consecrated elements as a symbol (*figura*) of the body and blood of Christ.[3] Similar terminology appears in the Mozarabic liturgies, but it was afterwards deleted from the Roman Missal.[4]

---

[1] *Hom.* xxvii. 17. (M. 34, 705B).

[2] M. 18, 684D.

[3] Chevalier *Repertoire des Sources Hist.*; but he may have survived till 372–80.

[4] *Haer.* lx. 6. (M. 41, 981A.)

[5] *Dial.* ii. (M. 83, 165D f.) but Theodoret teaches rather a dualism than symbolism. *Cf.* Batiffol, pp. 454 ff. Rauschen, p. 25, traces the conversion of the elements in his teaching, but this seems excluded by Theodoret's statement that Christ did not change the nature (φύσις) of the elements, and that their former essence remains. On the Antiochenes, *cf.* Steitz, xii. 211 f. They wavered between dynamic symbolism and dynamic realism.

[6] xiii. (Edit. Funk, ii. 174.)

[7] Funk, ii. 176.

[8] v. 14; vi. 23, 30; vii. 25. (Migne i. 873C, 973A, 988B, 1017A), but ii. 33, and viii. 12 are realist expressions. On symbolism in the *Apos. Const.*, *cf.* Steitz, x. 409.

[9] Funk ii. 111.

If proof were wanting that "symbol" and "antitype" were widely used at the end of the fourth century in a symbolical sense it is forthcoming in the statements of Macarius, Bishop of Magnesia in Asia Minor, and of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429) respectively, statements which also indicate the gradual growth of realism during that era. Writing shortly after 410 Macarius[5] says: "Christ having taken the bread and the cup, said 'This is My body and My blood,' not the figure (τύπος) of the body, nor the figure of the blood, *as some, without consideration* (πεπωρωμένοι) have devised, but are truly the body and blood."[6] Batiffol remarks, "evidently the word σύμβολον, the word τύπος, were words henceforth discredited."[7] Truly, but evidently also, the symbolical significance of these words, indicated by formal theological disquisitions and by the liturgies, was the common usage throughout the fourth century. The interpretation of Macarius represents an innovation, and illustrates the development of realism at the beginning of the fifth century. Theodore of Mopsuestia writes: "Christ did not say 'This is the symbol (σύμβολον) of my body and blood,' but 'This is My body and blood,'"[8] but apparently Theodore did not entirely break away from the usage against which he protests. He was charged by Leontius of Byzantium with describing the Eucharist as a type (τύπος).[9]

---

[1] Edition Hauler, p. 112 (quoted by Batiffol, p. 389).

[2] On the authorship *cf. Berengar*, p. 270 n. 4.

[3] v. 21 (Hurter, xxxviii. 53).

[4] Batiffol, p. 361.

[5] Macarius the Elder (d. 390) followed the symbolism of Greg. Naz. (*cf.* Steitz, x. 143).

[6] *Apokritos* III, 23 (Ed. C. Blondel, 1876, p. 105 f.).

[7] P. 391.

[8] *In Matt.* xxvi. 26. (Migne 66, 713B.)

[9] *Adv. Incorrupticolas*, 6. (M. 86, 1364B.) On Theodore's symbolism *cf.* Steitz, xii. 212, 218 ff.

The realist interpretation of "type" and "antitype" began as early as the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, who was delivering his famous Catechetical lectures in 347. It was strengthened by the monophysite tendency of Cappadocian theology, later adopted by the Alexandrians, and was markedly present in the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa (d. *c.* 395) who together with Cyril of Jerusalem[1] laid the foundation for the mediaeval doctrine of Transubstantiation. Gregory describes the effect of consecration as a "transmaking" (*μεταποιεῖν*),[2] or "translation" (*μετατιθέναι*)[3] of the elements into the body and blood of Christ. This is not Transubstantiation; it attempts to describe a change of formal being, a new relativity, indicating more than an increase of potency or effectiveness, but less than a change of essence or appearance. It expresses a change qualitative not quantitative, or as Loofs says, Transformation, not Transubstantiation.[4] The latter notion is foreign to Greek thought in this era, as Nestorius showed, when criticising the doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria. Nestorius maintained that "the bread is bread in nature and in essence (*οὐσία*). Yet he also upheld the presence of the body of Christ in its essence (*οὐσία*),[5] and developed the dualism of Irenaeus into a theory of Consubstantiation, the characteristic eucharistic doctrine of the dyophysite theological school of Antioch.

Gregory's use of the phrase "change of element" (*μεταστοιχειοῦν*)[6] suggests that his mind was playing with the idea of Transubstantiation, but Bethune-Baker points out that "the idea seems to be not the substitution of one element for another, but the re-arrangement of the same elements and the imposition upon them of a new 'form,' due to the new relation into which the elements of bread and wine have been brought, resulting in their possession of new qualities or properties. . . . The στοιχεία are of course the constituents of the bread and of the wine, not the 'elements' in the modern sense in connection with the Eucharist."[1] We may add that the term Transformation is certainly misleading to modern readers, but Gregory of Nyssa avoided the use of "Transformation" in the modern sense of a change of appearance by refraining from the term μετασχηματίζειν (change of outward form), and so preserved the external qualities of the elements—colour, smell, flavour. He conceived of form in the Aristotelian sense of "forma," as distinct from outward appearance and essential being.

---

[1] *Cf.* Bareille, Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1144; Rückert, p. 420; Steitz, x. 420, but Steitz (p. 421) qualifies Cyril's realism; yet, *cf.* p. 412, Cyril was the first writer to treat Baptism, the Chrism, and the Eucharist as a whole (p. 422).

[2] *Orat. Catech.* xxxvii. (M. 45, 93C ff.)

[3] *Orat. Catech.* xxxvii. (*Ibid.* 96D, etc.)

[4] P. 54; Steitz, x. 439 ff. Rauschen, pp. 33 and 37 accepts this view with qualification, there was in Gregory's teaching a taking-up or appropriation by the glorified body, i.e., the Assumption theory of Loofs and Harnack, but yet in a transubstantiationist sense. So also Rückert, p. 408 f.

[5] Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius*, p. 146; but Steitz, xii. 225 thinks that in spite of his language, Nestorius was a symbolist.

[6] *Orat. Catech.* xxxvii. (Migne 45, 97B.)

But the idea of "otherness" (ἀλλοίωσις), to quote another term of Gregory of Nyssa,[2] of a change as the result of consecration, was rapidly coming into the service of sacramental exposition. Shortly before Gregory's time it had been used by Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), who described the effect of the invocation (ἐπίκλησις) and descent of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine as a change (μεταβάλλειν) into the body and blood of Christ.[3] Chrysostom (d. 395), whose language, when all allowances are made for the extravagance of a rhetorical preacher, expresses the doctrine of the real presence in unmistakable terms,[4] appears to go beyond the conception of Gregory of Nyssa, when describing the sacramental change. He uses terms expressing a change of fashion or order or equipment (μεταῤῥυθμίζειν,[5] μετασκευάζειν).[6]

Rückert[7] and the Catholic writers go too far in one direction when they describe the metabolism of Gregory of Nyssa as the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and if Loofs' apology for him is also exaggerated, it errs rather in stress than in content. He rightly says that if the prevalent view of Gregory's teaching were justified, it is curious that Cyril of Alexandria, whose teaching was influenced by Gregory, did not give expression to it.[1] Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) was content in his controversy with Nestorius, to define the change, like Gregory, by the term μεταποιεῖν.[2] It is sufficient to conclude with Harnack that Gregory did not teach Transubstantiation in the later western sense.[1]

---

[1] *Early Hist. of Christian Doc.*, p. 413, n. 2.

[2] ἀλλοιωτική δύναμις (*Orat. Catech.* xxxvii. 2. Migne 45, 96B.)

[3] *Catech. Myst.* iii. 3. (M. 33, 1092A); v. 7 (M. 33, 1116A).

[4] *Cf.* Steitz, *X.* 446 ff. But Chrysostom does not identify the sacramental body with the body which died on the cross (*ibid.* p. 451) in the later western sense, but *cf.* p. 458.

[5] *In prodit. Jud. Hom.* i. 6. (Migne 49, 380.)

[6] *In Matt. Hom.* lxxxii. 5. (M. 58, 744.) He appears to regard the term as synonymous with μεταῤῥυθμίζειν; *cf. In Gen. Hom.* ii. 2. (M. 53, 28); *In Psalm* cxlvii. 1. (M. 55, 480); xxv. 6; xli. 6; (M. 53, 226 f., 383).

[7] Pp. 403 ff.

The idea of a sacramental change after consecration entered the West through the writings of Ambrose (d. 397). It does not appear in the writings of Hilary (d. 366–368), who was content to emphasise the doctrine of the real presence as the means of our unity with Christ, although as he was a devoted student of Origen, his teaching maintained a high spiritual level.[3] Ambrose, his contemporary, on the other hand, supplied the Latin writers of the middle ages with classical texts for the complete formulation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Without developing a theory of Transubstantiation, Ambrose let loose ideas upon which Lanfranc and Guitmund in the eleventh century grounded their doctrine. Ambrose's teaching is clearer than that of the Greek Fathers.[4] He describes the sacramental process or change as a conversion (*conversio*) of the nature (*natura*) of the elements, a preparation (*conficere*)[5] of the body of Christ; as a change (*mutare*)[6] of the species of the elements; a transfiguration (*transfigurare*) of the Sacraments into the body and blood of the Lord.[7] In addition to the use of the terms "conficere," "commutare"[8] in the *De Sacramentis*, which, since the recent exhaustive enquiry of Faller[9] may be regarded as the work of Ambrose, he says that the body of Christ did not exist before consecration, but does exist afterwards.[1] The sacramental body is identical with the body which Christ received from the Virgin.[2]

---

[1] P. 54.

[2] *Comment in Matt.* xxvi. 27. (M. 72, 452C.) Steitz, xii. 213, 235 ff., holds that Cyril defines a dynamic rather than a substantial presence of Christ. Rückert, p. 412f., emphasises more strongly Cyril's realism. His teaching influenced the Monophysites (*ibid.* pp. 248 ff.).

[3] Adam, p. 46 ff.; but Rückert, pp. 460 ff., finds materialism in Hilary.

[4] Rauschen, p. 33. [5] *De Myst.* ix. 52 f. [6] *De Myst.* ix. 50, 52.

[7] *De Fide*, iv. 10, 124; *De Incarn.* iv. 23.

[8] *De Sac.* iv. 14–15.

[9] *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (1929), pp. 41–65. Even if not written by Ambrose, Batiffol dates it as early as 400 at Milan (p. 346). Loofs, p. 60 f., was able to deny the doctrine of Transubstantiation in Ambrose by denying to him the authorship of the *De Mysteriis* as well as the *De Sacramentis*, although he allows that it appears in *De Fide*. iv. 10, 124.

The innovating character of Ambrose's teaching in the West is shown by a comparison with the doctrine of his younger contemporary Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia (d.410). The Eucharist is still the mystery of the bread and wine (*in mysterio panis et vini*),[3] or Sacrament of the Lord's body (*sacramentum dominici corporis*),[4] and the elements are symbolical of the body and blood, broken and shed in the Passion (*in figura corporis ejus ac sanguinis*).[5] The species of the wine properly means His blood, for when He said "I am the true vine," He declared that the whole of the wine offered as a figure (*in figura*) of His Passion is His blood.[6] He gave the consecrated bread and wine (*panem consecratum et vinum*) to the disciples as a pledge (*pignus*) of His presence,[7] and He desired souls to be sanctified through the image (*imaginem*) of His own Passion. Reasonably in that bread the symbol (*figura*) of the body of Christ is received, which although so manifold in the human race, is yet made one.[8]

If Gaudentius also says that God produces (*producit*) the proper (*proprium*) body from the bread, and makes (*facit*) the blood from the wine, this realist statement cannot shake the symbolical foundation of his doctrine. Batiffol has pointed out that the language of Gaudentius can be traced in two Mozarabic liturgies,[9] in which the eucharistic sacrifice is said to be translated into or offered in the similitude (*in similitudinem*) of the body and blood of the Lord.[10] Batiffol contends that "similitudo" is here equivalent to "sacramentum," but if so, and if it be read in the light of the researches of de Ghellinck and his collaborators, Batiffol's comparison does not admit the realist construction which he desires to place on the teaching of Gaudentius. It rather confirms the conclusion that Gaudentius was a symbolist. Moreover, the Mozarabic translation into a similitude is entirely free from the notion of Transubstantiation. It expresses merely a change of value, significance or effectiveness.

---

[1] *De Sac.* iv. 16; *cf.* v. 24.

[2] *De Myst.* ix. 53.

[3] *Sermo* ii. (M. 20, 855A).

[4] *Ibid.* 858B, 860B.

[5] *Sermo* xix. (M. 20, 989C.)

[6] *Sermo* ii. (M. 20, 855B.)

[7] *Ibid.* 859B.

[8] *Ibid.* 860A.

[9] *Cf.* Férotin *Le Liber mozarabicus sacramentorum* (1912), quoted by Batiffol, p. 363.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 197, 321, 342, 576.

In the teaching of Jerome, instinct with the devotion to the language of Scripture of an assiduous Bible student, the influence of Origen is so marked that in the middle ages passages from Origen were sometimes mistakenly attributed to him.[1] In a comment on S. John vi. 53, he says that in his opinion the "body of Jesus is the Gospel . . . the body of Christ and His blood is the word of the Scriptures, the divine teaching. So when we go to the mystery (i.e. the Eucharist) he who is faithful understands that if he has fallen into sin, he is in danger. If, when we hear the word of God, and when the word of God—and Christ's flesh and blood—is poured into our ears, we think otherwise, into what danger do we fall?[2] In the flesh of Christ, which is the word of doctrine—that is, as we hold, the interpretation of the Scriptures—we receive the food."[3] In his comment on Ephesians i. 7, he refers to the same passage in S. John, and says that it is interpreted in two ways, spiritually as when He said "My flesh is meat indeed" . . . and historically, with reference to the flesh and blood which were crucified.[4]

While sacramental doctrine in the West had thrown out a current in the direction of materialistic realism and metabolism in the teaching of Ambrose, the main stream of the ancient symbolical teaching was maintained and reinforced by the doctrine of Augustine (d. 430). The existence of the two currents in Western eucharistic doctrine of later days has been observed by Batiffol,[5] and if in later centuries the Ambrosian tradition becomes more and more predominant, it was never able to assimilate and overcome the powerful Augustinian system. It has been suggested that Augustine was not aware of the metabolist teaching of Gregory of Nyssa and of Ambrose.[6] The more valuable then is his own teaching as a revelation of the natural development of doctrine in the West, when uninfluenced by Eastern conceptions. Most interpreters are agreed that no theory of

---

[1] *Cf.* Berengar, *D.S.C.*, p. 269; Abelard, *Sic et Non* (M. 178, 1529C).

[2] M. 26, 1259A (*Brev. in Psa.* cxlvii.).

[3] *Ibid.* 1259B. These two passages are not noticed by Darwell Stone.

[4] M. 26. 451A (*Ad Eph.* Lib. i. cap. 1).

[5] *L'Eucharistie* (1905), pp. 347 ff.

[6] Adam, pp. 43, 54, 61.

Transformation, still less of Transubstantiation appears in his writings.[1] If he uses occasionally the terms "conficere,"[2] "fieri,"[3] it is not in the Ambrosian sense of the "preparation" or "becoming" of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. Yet his language has always been quoted by Catholic writers in support of the doctrine of the real presence. What does he say?

"That bread which you see on the altar, consecrated through the Word of God, is the body of Christ (*sanctificatus per verbum Dei, corpus Christi est*). That cup, yes indeed, what the cup contains, consecrated by the Word of God is the blood of Christ" (*sanguis Christi est*).[4]

What does he mean? for, to quote his own words, which immediately precede this statement, "you ought to know what you have received, what you will receive, what you ought to receive daily." The reply is not obscure. "Through these things the Lord Jesus Christ desired to commend (*commendare*) His body and His blood, which He shed for us for the forgiveness of sins." But he does not stop there: "If you have received well, you are what you have received (*vos estis quod accepistis*) for the Apostle says 'we many are one bread, one body.' There is commended (*commendatur*) to you in that bread how (*quomodo*) you ought to love unity. Was that bread made from one grain? Were there not many grains of wheat? But before they became bread they were separate; through water they were joined. . . . Ye are made the bread which is the body of Christ (*Efficimini panis, quod est corpus Christi*), and so the unity is signified (*significatur*) in a clear (*quodam*) manner."[5]

Augustine's realist language, then (*corpus Christi est*), has no realist meaning. The phrase "body of Christ" for him signifies (he uses the word *significatur*) the mystical union of the faithful in the communion of fellowship, the ancient and original interpretation given to the Lord's words. Nor was this statement the passing rhetoric of a moment of mystical emotion. He addressed the "baptised" again: "When ye receive the Spirit of fire ye are as they who are baked (*quasi cocti estis*). Be what you are and receive what you are. . . . Brethren recollect whence the wine comes (*fit*). Many grapes (*grana*) hang on the vine, but the liquid of the grapes is mingled together in unity. And so the Lord Jesus Christ showed us that He wished us to be related to (*pertinere*) Himself. He consecrated the mystery of our peace and unity on His table. He who receives the mystery (*mysterium*) of unity, and does not hold the bond of peace, does not receive the mystery for himself, but a testimony against himself."[1] This explanation, like that in *Sermo ccxxvii.* is given expressly as an interpretation of the phrases *corpus Christi* and *sanguis Christi.* The same idea lies behind both sermons. The Eucharist is the sacrament or mystery of unity among believers. Its very food is fellowship. "The body of Christ, if you wish to understand, hear the Apostle saying 'Ye are the body of Christ and members.' If therefore ye are the body of Christ and members, your mystery is placed on the Lord's Table, you receive as your mystery that which you are (*id quod estis*) . . . You hear the phrase 'Body of Christ,' and you reply 'Amen.' Be a member of the body of Christ that the 'Amen' may be true."[2]

---

[1] But *cf. infra*, p. 76.
[2] *De Trin.* iii. 21.
[3] *Con. Faust* xx. 3 (*cf.* Harnack v. 159, n. 1).
[4] *Sermo*, 227.
[5] *Ibid.* 227.

In a third passage the same teaching is given: "The Apostle Paul, explaining to us this bread, says 'We many are one body.' O! sacrament of piety. O! sign (*signum*) of unity. O! bond of love."[3] Augustine makes vivid the symbolism of unity by describing the communion as a feeding of the members upon themselves, that is to say, the effective principle of union lies not merely in the act, but in the content of the action, in the food received. This food and drink he wishes to be understood as the society and members of His body, which is the Church.[4]

So, also, he interprets the Eucharist as a symbol of our unity with Christ: "He Himself shows, speaking in John vi. 57, what it is to eat the body of Christ and to drink His blood, not only in the Sacrament but in the real thing (*non sacramento tenus, sed re vera*): this is indeed to remain in Christ so that Christ may remain in him."[5] Sacramental feeding symbolises our union with Christ, it is a spiritual

[1] *Sermo*, 272. [2] *Ibid.* 272; *cf. De Civ. Dei* xxii. 10.

[3] *In Joan. Tract.* xxvi. 13. [4] *Ibid.* 15.

[5] *De Civ. Dei* xxi. 35; *cf. Sermo*, 71, 17.

process quite unrelated to the notion of a corporal or real feeding upon a body actually present. The true or real thing (*res vera*) is something contrasted with and therefore independent of the Sacrament. Just as in the other metaphors feeding upon the body and blood of Christ signified a feeding upon themselves as members of that body, and so indicated the spiritual unity of the faithful upon earth, so here, feeding upon the body of Christ signifies the spiritual unity of the faithful with the risen Lord. In the one case "to feed" is to be in union one with another; in the other it is to "remain in Him."

The conception of an actual feeding occupies no place in his teaching. As a subjective process sacramental feeding is the exercise of faith. "For what do you prepare your teeth and yourself? Believe and you have eaten."[1] "Do not prepare the throat, but the heart. So that supper is commended. Behold we believe in Christ when we receive with faith. In receiving we know what we conceive (*cogitemus*). We receive a small portion (*modicum*) and we are nourished in the heart. Therefore not that which is seen, but what is believed feeds."[2] The conception of faith or belief as a life-giving process, derived from S. John iii. 16, and various passages in S. John vi, appears to lie behind Augustine's language. The terms "to eat" and "to drink" symbolise spiritual understanding or apprehension in the Origenist sense. One thing is seen, another is understood.[3] "Not this which you see are you about to eat and drink. The sacrament which I have commended to you will give life if spiritually understood."[4] The term "intelligere" means more than mere understanding or comprehension, it denotes apprehension or grasping by the mind. "It is a crime to take literally the Lord's words concerning eating."[5]

The notion of feeding on the real body of Christ appears to be finally excluded when Augustine discusses the offence given to some of Christ's followers by His language reported in S. John vi.: "Certainly He who could ascend to heaven whole could not be consumed. . . . To eat is to be satisfied, but so eat that ye may not misunderstand whence ye are fed. What is to drink but to live? Eat life, drink life. Ye shall have life, and life is whole. The Lord says it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing."[1] To eat or drink sacramentally is to "live" in Christ. "There is no presence of Christ according to the body (*secundum corporis praesentiam . . . non est hic*).[2] You have Christ present through faith, through a sign (*per signum*), through the Sacrament of Baptism, through the food and cup (he does not say through the body and blood) of the altar,"[3] and he asks how, if Christ is sitting at the right hand of the Father, can the bread be His body and the cup His blood (*quomodo est panis corpus ejus et calix . . . quomodo est sanguis ejus*).[4] Adam tries to overcome this convincing statement by saying that "quomodo" only possesses a symbolic significance; and affirms that it indicates no contrast between the corporal species and the spiritual fruit.[5] But Augustine only admits a presence of the majesty or a presence for faith in all Christians.[6] At the utmost "to have Christ present through the food and drink of the altar" means to have the grace of Christ.[7]

---

[1] *In Joan. Tract.* xxv. 12.

[2] *Sermo*, 112, 5.

[3] *Sermo*, 272.

[4] *Enarr. in Psa. xcviii.* 9.

[5] *De Doc. Christ.* iii. 16.

No doubt Augustine's writings contain several other passages in which the language implies a real presence,[8] and in one instance the sacramental content is described as the flesh which Christ received from the Virgin.[9] One of these passages (*Enarr. in Psa. xxxiii.* 1, 10), claimed by Catholic writers as a *locus classicus* for the doctrine of the real presence,[10] hardly bears a realist interpretation. Augustine, commenting on the statement "and he was borne in their hands,"[11] regards it as a prophecy of the Last Supper when Christ took bread and gave it into their hands, saying "This is My body." But that which Christ delivered to the disciples at the Last Supper was certainly not His real body, and this notion is repudiated by Augustine in his Commentary on S. John. "According to the presence of the flesh rightly it was said to the disciples, 'Me ye have not always.'"[12]

---

[1] *Sermo*, 131, 1.

[2] *In Joan. Tract. l.* 13.

[3] *In Joan. Tract. l.* 12.

[4] *Sermo*, 272.

[5] P. 118.

[6] *In Joan. Tract. l.* 13 and *Sermo*, 361, 7.

[7] *In Joan. Tract. l.* 12.

[8] *De Trin.* iii. 21; *Enarr. in Psa. xxxiii.* 2, 10; *Sermo*, 71, 11; 234, 2; 310, 2, etc.

[9] *Enarr. in Psa. xcviii.* 9.

[10] *Cf.* Batiffol, p. 436f.

[11] Aug. gives the Septuagint version of 1 Sam. xxi. 13. The A.V. and R.V. following the Heb. has "feigned himself mad in their hands."

[12] *In Joan. Tract. l.* 13.

To interpret this and similar passages as the fundamental doctrine of Augustine, and to explain the teaching which we have already considered in the light of them, errs in two directions. Firstly, the true method of exegesis is thereby reversed. A true exegesis will explain Augustine's realist language by the aid of his own explicit interpretations, and by the doctrine which is implicit in his general theory of the sacrament.[1] It may be replied that Augustine's explanations are concerned with subsidiary aspects of the Eucharist, and this would be a valid argument—although by no means a safe conclusion—in the absence of information concerning the general background of his thought, and particularly if he had held no specific theory of the Sacrament.

Secondly, this method is prone to read into Augustine's teaching the doctrinal developments of a later age, sometimes even to the extent of perceiving in his teaching the theory of Transubstantiation.[2] Even Adam, who denies that he taught Transubstantiation,[3] concludes that he left the way open for its appearance.[4] The only effect of consecration stated by Augustine is the mention of a mystical effect, not the birth of a sacramental body (*certa consecratione mystica fit nobis non nascitur*).[5]

The background of Augustine's thought is as well known as that of Origen. Like Origen, he was a Platonist.[6] Whether or not Neo-Platonism affords a valid instrument of interpretation for Christian doctrine, we are not called upon to decide. But it is of supreme importance to recollect that long years of Augustine's early training were passed in the Neo-Platonist schools. From their influence he never entirely broke away,[7] and it is hardly conceivable that a Christian Platonist could regard the sacramental element as anything but the type of the heavenly archetype who was not in any sense present with or under the mystical covering of the type. In the mind of Augustine the two remained distinct. The change of significance or value

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 77 f.

[2] For a list of these writers *cf.* Adam, p. 3 f.; Batiffol, p. 432 f.

[3] P. 57. [4] Pp. 159, 163. [5] *Con. Faust*, xx. 13.

[6] *Cf.* Adam, 100, 124 f., 140 f.

[7] Adam, pp. 5, 44, 103, 163, thinks that later in life, especially during the Pelagian dispute, Augustine broke away entirely from Platonism and Origenism. He quotes S. A. Harnack *Die Retraktationen Augustins* 1905), pp. 16, 22 ff.

associated with the elements by consecration was the effect of the operation of the Word of God (*sanctificatus per Verbum Dei*).[1] "This bread and wine, when the Word approaches, becomes the body and blood of the Word" (*accedente verbo fit corpus et sanguis Verbi*)[2] or "becomes a sacrament" of the Word (*accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*).[3] But Origen, who had used similar language, simply regarded the consecrated elements as a symbol of the Logos. Augustine also describes the Holy Spirit as the agent of consecration.[4]

When we examine Augustine's theory of the Sacrament it becomes even less possible to interpret his teaching in a realist sense, especially if he wrote under the influence of Tertullian.[5] According to Augustine a sacrament is a "sacred sign" (*sacramentum . . . sacrum signum*),[6] it is something beyond the form which it denotes to the senses, causing something else from itself to be perceived (*signam est res praeter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cognitionem venire*).[7] One thing is seen, another is understood (*aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur*).[8] It is a sign pertaining to a divine thing.[9] The significance of the sacred symbol is thus distinguished from its appearance or form. This significance is not material, save in the sense that the spoken word is perceptible as sound, while its inward meaning is apprehended by the mind.[10] There is the Sacrament or element and the "thing of the Sacrament" (*res sacramenti*)[11] or "virtue of the Sacrament"[12]—its spiritual significance.

This clearly defined distinction constitutes Augustine's great contribution to sacramental doctrine. Its weakness lies in the fact that it leaves the way open for the realist interpretation of "the thing of the Sacrament," as an unseen reality. This interpretation is now less possible since the ancient usage of the term "sacrament" has been shown to be largely free from the notion of a covered spiritual presence. The Sacrament is not, and does not conceal that which it symbolises. Moreover, the realist interpretation is neutralised by Augustine's own explanation of the spiritual significance of the "res sacramenti." While he says that the signs of things are visible, but invisible things are honoured in them,[1] yet the invisible thing is a virtue (*virtus vero pietatis invisibilis et spiritalis*),[2] an invisible grace which God gives and operates through the visible form of the Sacrament (*operatur per illum deus visibilem sacramenti formam, ipse autem sacramentorum donat invisibilem gratiam*).[3] The Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament (*virtus sacramenti*) is another,[4] and he equates the term grace with virtue,[5] and grace with the "thing" or content of the Sacrament.[6] Therefore the terms "body" and "blood" in the Augustinian sacramental theory signify virtue or grace—the power which sustains piety, the grace which illuminates and nourishes the soul. Grace is not consumed by the teeth.[7] The Augustinian idea of a sacrament is exactly expressed by our own Catechism, where it is defined as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace."

---

[1] *Sermo.* 127.

[2] *Sermo. ined.* vi. 1 (Migne 46, 835 f.).

[3] *In Joan. Tract.* lxxx. 3.

[4] *De Trin.* iii. 4, 10.

[5] *Cf.* Adam, pp. 8 ff. Recent researches into Tertullian's use of "sacramentum" of course react upon Augustine. Adam's book was written before they were published, but Adam so far dissociates himself from the ordinary interpretation of Tertullian as to say that Tertullian does not reveal the realist belief (realistischen Glauben) but the realist terminology of his day (p. 10, n. 1). He applies the term real-supernatural (Real Ubernatüralisches) to Tertullian's interpretation of the Eucharist (p. 11).

[6] *De Civ. Dei.* x. 5.

[7] *De Doc. Christ,* ii. 1.

[8] *Sermo.* 272; *cf. De Doc. Christ.* ii. 1; *Epis.* 55, 1.

[9] *Ep.* 138, 1 (Signa) quae cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur.

[10] *Con. Faust* xix. 16 quasi visibilia sacrosancta *cf. De Doc. Christ.* i. 2. Sunt autem alia signa quorum omnis usus in significando est. . . . Nemo enim igitur utitur verbis nisi aliquid significanda gratia.

[11] *Ep.* 98, 9; 185, 11; *Sermo.* 272; *De Cat. Rud.* 26; *De Civ. Dei.* x. 20.

[12] *In Joan. Tract.* xxvi. 11.

Between the external symbols of the Sacrament and the internal grace an intrinsic relation of comparison must exist. The action as well as the external appearance of the sacramental substance must express the inward spiritual process and fact. "If sacraments had not a certain likeness of those things of which they are sacraments, they would not in any way be sacraments" (*Si enim sacramenta quamdam similitudinem rerum earum quorum sacramenta sunt non*

---

[1] *De Cat. Rud.* 26.
[2] *Sermo.* 71, 32.
[3] *Epis.* 105, Geiselmann, p. 295, wrongly quotes Sermo 166, misled by the footnote to Gratian C.32 *Dist. ii de Cons.* (Migne 187, 1744C.). He has not noticed that the commentator quotes from the old classification of Augustine's letters. *Cf. Quaest in Hept.* iii. 84.
[4] *In Joan. Tract.* xxvi. 11.
[5] *Enarr. in Psa. lxxvii.* 2, gratia sacramentorum virtus est.
[6] *Quaest in Hept.* iii. 84.
[7] *In Joan. Tract.* xxvii. 3.

haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent).[1] This passage occurs in a discussion on the Eucharist, and conveys the fundamental idea of Augustine's definition of the Eucharist, which springs directly from his sacramental theory. A sacrament is a "similitude," or likeness, in a certain mode (*quemdam modum*) of the body and blood of Christ, just as Baptism is a sacrament of faith.[2] We are to believe that this similitude signifies something spiritual which pertains to holy conduct and to future life.[3] The significance of "similitude" is not left ambiguous. It means simply the "sign" or "figure" of the body and blood. "The Lord did not hesitate to say 'This is my Body,' when He gave the sign of His body."[4] "He delivered and commended to the disciples at the supper the figure of His body and blood" (*corporis et sanguinis sui figuram*),[5] a term which Augustine also uses of the Eucharist to indicate a memorial of the Passion,[6] and he also describes the Sacrament as a pledge (*pignus*) of the death of Christ.[7] The terms "body" and "blood" are mere names given to the Sacrament by Christ Himself.[8]

Rückert,[9] Harnack,[10] and Loofs,[11] and the Protestant writers generally, are justified in perceiving in Augustine's teaching the ancient symbolism of Christian tradition. But it is not a bare symbolism in the sacramentarian sense. The symbolism or similarity is only the condition, not the operating cause of the sacramental quality of the sign.[12] It is not the being itself of which it bears the name.[13] Geiselmann, following Loofs, defines it as "dynamic symbolism,"[14] a symbolism which effectively moves the soul and feeds it with spiritual life. This expresses the signifying grace of our own "Articles." The Eucharist is an agency or instrument of divine grace or virtue, which contributes to the eternal life of the soul. The consecrated elements are holy symbols possessing the significance or value of the body and blood of Christ.

For the rest Augustine describes the Eucharist as a

[1] *Epis.* 98, 9.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Cat. Rud.* 50.

[4] *Contra Adimant.* xii. 3.

[5] *Enarr. in Psa. iii.* 1.

[6] *De Doc. Christ.* iii. 16, 24.

[7] *Sermo.* 334, 2.

[8] Rückert, p. 362.

[9] Pp. 365–9.

[10] V. 159 n.

[11] P. 63.

[12] Rückert, p. 357.

[13] Rückert, p. 361.

[14] *Cf. Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* (1924), (*Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte* xv.).

"memorial Sacrament" (*sacramentum memoriae*);[1] a Celebration (*celebratio*) of the body and blood of Christ;[2] a communion (*communicatio*) of the Lord's body;[3] the Lord's Supper (*cœna Domini*);[4] the Lord's Table (*mensa Dominica*);[5] terms which illustrate the Evangelical trend of his thought. If he also uses realist *language*, so far as this was inspired by the words of institution it has a Scriptural sanction; moreover, it was the current usage of the liturgies.[6] Possibly he adopted it under the stress of the Donatist controversy over re-baptism,[7] and he may have been under the influence, at times, of the rhetorical language of the African school and the Tertullianic tradition.[8] This language doubtless causes difficulty in interpreting his doctrine, but a difficulty which is less than the Catholic writers find in explaining away his symbolism,[9] and Rauschen concludes that while some of Augustine's expressions do not exclude the real presence, he inclines to a symbolical interpretation of the Eucharist.[10] Under the most favourable exegesis the Catholic writers can hardly claim more, and Geiselmann their most recent representative definitely places Augustine among the dynamic writers of the middle ages.

The second half of the fifth century in the West was occupied with the increasing incursions of the northern tribes, culminating in the fall of the west Roman Empire before the Goths in 476. Until the time of Pope Gregory the Great at the end of the sixth century, no great theological writer appeared in Europe. Pope Leo I. (d. 461) was a realist,[11] but the Augustinian tradition was handed on to the middle ages. It appears in the teaching of Pope Gelasius I.

---

[1] *Con. Faust.* xx. 21.

[2] *De Doc. Christ.* iii. 9.

[3] *In Joan. Tract.* xxvi. 15, *cf.* xlvii. 2.

[4] *Sermo*, 112, 4.

[5] *Sermo*, 227, 272; *In Joan. Tract.* xxvi. 15; *Confessions* xiii. 21.

[6] *Cf.* Rückert, p. 363; Loofs, p. 62.

[7] Harnack, v. 157; but Batiffol, p. 453, interprets the influence of the Donatists in the reverse direction. It drove Augustine to use mystical language.

[8] *Cf.* Adam, p. 12.

[9] *Cf.* Batiffol, p. 422, Rauschen, pp. 17, 20f. Adam, pp. 54, 104f., 121, admits a dynamic spiritual tendency. Gore *Dissertations*, p. 233f., sees in his teaching Consubstantiation, and Adam finds a theo-physical parallelism (pp. 106, 136, 154, 156).

[10] P. 21. Augustinus neigt zur symbolischen Erklärung der Eucharistie hin, aber einzelne seiner Ausspruche machen es wahrscheinlich dass er damit die reale Gegenwart nicht ausschliessen will. Adam, pp. 49, 54, points out that he does not quote Ambrose *De Myst.*

[11] Bareille, p. 1153.

(492–496) at the end of the century. In a treatise on the two natures in the Person of Christ, written to confute the theory of two Persons in Christ, popularly but wrongly attributed to Nestorius,[1] and to counteract the monophysitism of Eutyches, Gelasius draws an illustration from the Sacrament. The context and the interpretation given of the Eucharist show that his theory of the Sacrament was dualistic. While he preserves the divine substance (*divina substantia*) in the Incarnation, he says that the substance of the bread and wine do not cease to be (*non desinit substantia panis et vini*). They remain in their own nature (*permanentes tamen in suae proprietate naturae*). His definition includes the Augustinian formula of symbolism. The bread and wine are an image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ (*imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi*), and he describes the presence of the divine substance as an efficacy or virtue represented by the consecrated elements (*efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repraesentant*), rather than a really present divine being.[2] Rauschen goes further than most Catholic writers, and traces the doctrine of the conversion of the elements in the teaching of Gelasius.[3] He certainly describes a passing over (*transeant*) of the elements into the divine substances, but the careful statement that their actual substance remains, shows that he does not conceive of a substantial conversation or change, but rather a union of the spiritual and material, and this again, rather as an illustration of the union of the divine and human natures in the Incarnation than an explanation of the sacramental process. Bareille is driven to conclude that Gelasius was guilty of error, but it was the error of a private teacher, not that of the Pope giving a definition of the faith. The doctrine of Gelasius, he says, remains an isolated and unique interpretation in the Latin Church.[4]

The teaching of Fulgentius of Ruspe (d. 533) is free from dualism. In the Eucharist bread and wine, not body and blood, are offered (*sacrificium panis et vini*), as a sacrifice of thanksgiving (*in isto sacrificio gratiarum actio*) and a commemoration of the flesh of Christ which He offered for us, and of His blood which He shed for us; and he draws a contrast between the Old Testament sacrifices, which gave a figurative (*figurate*) representation of Christ's future death, and the Eucharist which shows what has now been given in the past by His death. The one foretold (*praenuntiabatur*) what the other makes known (*annuntiatur*).[1] The body and blood of Christ symbolise the Church which is offered in the sacrament of the bread and wine.[2] The content of this spiritual sacrifice is love shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.[3] The faithful are not separated from the body of Christ if they die before receiving the Sacrament, for they have already been made partakers of the body and blood of Christ in Baptism.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and His Teaching* (1908).

[2] A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanum Pontificum Genuinae I* (1868), 541 f.

[3] P. 25. Rauschen criticises Batiffol, who classifies Gelasius as a dyophysist together with Theodoret and Nestorius (p. 50f.). *Cf.* Darwell Stone, i. 101 f.

[4] P. 1181.

Facundus of Hermiane (*c.* 547), another African, speaks of the body and blood of Christ always with the qualifying term "sacrament." "The Sacrament of His body and blood, which is consecrated in the bread and cup we call (*dicimus*) His body and blood, not because that bread is properly (*proprie*) His body, or the cup His blood, but since they contain the mystery of His body and blood, just as the Lord called (*vocavit*) the bread and chalice, which He delivered to the disciples, His body and blood. So when the faithful receive the Sacrament of His body and blood, they are rightly said to receive the body and blood of Christ."[5]

The only other sacramental writers belonging to this period were Cæsarius of Arles (d. 544), who was a realist-metabolist,[6] and Gregory of Tours (d. 593), who was a realist.[7] The history of sacramental doctrine in the age of the Fathers, closes in the West under the predominant influence of Augustinian symbolism.

---

[1] Migne, 65, 699, A–C.
[2] *Ibid.* 188C, 190B.
[3] *Ibid.* 192 B.
[4] *Ibid.* 392 D. *Cf.* Rückert, pp. 372 ff.
[5] *Ibid.* 67, 762C–763A; Rückert, p. 374 n.
[6] Rückert, p. 482.
[7] Bareille, p. 1182.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Adam, K. *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin* (1908) (*Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. VIII.).

Andersen, A. *Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christen* (1906).

"Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order—Report" (1930). Appendices 2–5 by Bishops Palmer and Gore, and Canon Quick. (pp. 51–66.)

Bareille, G. "Eucharistie d'après les Pères" (Vacant et Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, V, 1913, pp. 1121–1183).

Batiffol, P. *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, Deuxième Série (1905) and (1920).

Bethune-Baker, J. F. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (1903), pp. 393–417.

Bigg, C. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (1913).

Dimock, N. *On Eucharistic Worship in the English Church* (1911).

Faller, O. "Zur Echtheit von S. Ambrosii de Sacramentis" (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1929, pp. 41–65).

Feltoe, C. C. "A Study of some Eucharistic Phrases in the West" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, XI, 1910, pp. 575–579).

Funk, E. X. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, II (1905).

Ghellinck, J. de, etc. *Pour l'histoire du mot "Sacrament,"* I. *Les Antenicéens* (1924). (*Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense*, Fasc. 3.)

Goguel, M. *L'Eucharistie des Origines à Justin Martyr* (1910).

Gore, C. *Dissertations* (1895). *The Body of Christ* (1901).

Gwatkin, H. M. *Selections from Early Christian Writers* (1905).

Harnack, A. von. *History of Dogma* (Eng. Trans.), Vols. I, II, IV, and V (1894–1898).

Hoffmann, J. *Das Abendmahl in Urchristentum* (1909).

Hort, F. J. ’Ευχαριστία, ’Ευχαριστεῖν (*Journal of Theological Studies*, III, 1902, pp. 594–8).

Leimbach, C. L. *Beiträge zur Abendmahlslehre Tertullians* (1874).

Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers* (1898).

Loofs, F. "Abendmahl," II (Hauck-Herzog, *Realencyklopädie*, I, 1896, pp. 38–68).

Lowther Clarke, W. K. "The Early History of the Eucharist" (in *New Testament Problems*, 1929).

Nock, A. D. "Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background" (in *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson, 1928, pp. 120–139).

Rauschen, G. *Eucharistie und Busssakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche* (1910).

Réville, J. *Les Origines de l'Eucharistie* (1908).

Ruckert, L. J. *Das Abendmahl, sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten kirche* (1856).

Rule, M. "Transformare and Transformatio" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, XII, 1910–1911, pp. 413–427).

Soden, H. von. "μυστήριον und Sacramentum in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten der kirche" (*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII, 1911, pp. 188–227).

SRAWLEY, J. H. "Eucharist" (Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, V, 1912, pp. 546–555).

STEITZ, G. E. *Die Abendmahlslehre der griechishen Kirche in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung* (*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, IX–XIII, 1864–1868).

STONE, DARWELL. *The History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, I, 1910.

STRUCKMANN, A. *Die Gegenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie*, 1905 (*Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft*, Bd. 12).

SWETE, H. B. "Eucharistic Belief in the Second and Third Centuries" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, III, 1902, pp. 161–177).

TURNER, C. H. "*Figura Corporis Mei* in Tertullian" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, VII (1905–6), pp. 595–7).

III. SYMBOLISM IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES.

FROM THE CAROLINES TO BERENGAR.

A. J. MACDONALD.

THE history of sacramental doctrine in the pre-scholastic era is the record of the development, in depth, as well as width, of Ambrosian realism and metabolism, until Augustinian symbolism, which down to the Carolingian epoch continued to hold the field, was finally overwhelmed at the Lateran Council of 1215.[1] It is no part of our task to trace in detail this process;[2] we are concerned rather with the record of the stubborn persistency of the original Evangelical interpretation, which narrowly missed becoming recognised as the official doctrine of the Church, when Berengar failed to transform the private inclination of Hildebrand, into the public policy of Gregory VII.

The middle ages begin, for Church history in the West, with the pontificate of Gregory the Great (590–604), the last of the Fathers and the first of the mediaeval Popes. In Gregory's sacramental teaching realism predominates, and the legends preserved in his writings became a treasury of illustration for later realist writers. Yet the influence of Augustine has been traced in his teaching,[3] and in Gregory's sacramental doctrine we may see an indication of the restraining effect of Augustinian symbolism. Between the time of Gregory and Charles the Great, a period of about two hundred years, the literary remains of only four western writers on sacramental doctrine have been handed down—Faustus of Riez, Germain of Paris, Isidore of Seville, and Bede.

Faustus, Bishop of Riez in Provence (d. *c.* 492) rivalled the influence of Ambrose in preparing the ground for the mediaeval doctrine of Transubstantiation. His *Homily on the Body and Blood of Christ* was wrongly ascribed to Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa (*c.* 340–360) throughout this era. It was the first tractate devoted especially to the Eucharist, and was printed by Migne among the epistles of Jerome.[1] In the teaching of Isidore, Archbishop of Seville (*c.* 560–636) Augustinian symbolism is prominent. Since the bread strengthens the body it is called the body of Christ, and the wine, since it produces blood in the flesh, is referred to as the blood of Christ.[2] The hallowing of the elements by the Holy Spirit produces not the body of Christ, but the Sacrament of the body of Christ (*sacramentum divini corporis*).[3] The sacred elements are understood to signify something different, beneath their covering the divine virtue secretly works the saving efficacy of the same Sacraments.[4] Thus the manner (*conformatio*) of the Sacrament follows (*succedit*), so that the offering which is made to the Lord is fashioned (*conformatur*) after the body and blood of Christ.[5] In these statements no trace of the theory of a change of the elements appears. A Catholic writer has remarked that Isidore's teaching springs definitely from Augustine.[6]

---

[1] On the gradual development of the dogma of Transubstantiation, *cf.* Batiffol, p. 500 ff.

[2] A full account appears in my *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine.*

[3] Geiselmann, p. 44.

In the Venerable Bede (673–735) the realist current of interpretation is more perceptible.[7] But over against the conception of an actually present body Bede sets up the idea of the eucharistic content as a *sacrament* of the body of Christ,[8] a mystery,[9] or figure[10] of the same, and he adopts some features of Augustinian symbolism. The sacramental elements symbolise the Passion;[11] they stand in a mystical relation to the body and blood of Christ.[12] In a discussion on the distinction between the Sacrament and the "res" or "veritas," his description of the sacramental content as a virtue (*virtus*)[13] emphasises the ancient tradition,[14] and the contrast between Bede's lofty spiritual conception and later realism is emphasised by his teaching on Baptism, in which, he says, we receive the Lord's body, as well as in the Eucharist.[1] The notion of a real presence, confined to the Eucharist, was not yet fixed.

---

[1] Migne, 30, 271 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* 83, 755A.

[3] *Ibid.* 83, 755B; *cf.* 81, 255B.

[4] *Ibid.* 81, 255C; sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorundem sacramentorum operatur.

[5] *Ibid.* 83, 753A.

[6] Geiselmann, p. 72.

[7] *Cf.* Migne, 91, 217D; 259B; 506C; 634D; 94, 261B.

[8] *Ibid.* 91, 151C; 92, 207B; 271D.

[9] *Ibid.* 91, 25B; 71A; 152A; 498A; 513A; 516B; 597D; 718D; 94, 126A, and especially 91, 967A in *pane* corporis ipsius et in mixto *vino*, sanguinis sacrosanctum mysterium . . . ostenditur.

[10] *Ibid.* 92, 596C suae carnis sanguinisque sacramentum in panis ac vini figura. But here he gives the old Gallic idea of a symbolism of the bread and wine.

[11] *Ibid.* 92, 596B.

[12] *Ibid.* 92, 113B; 271C; 597A.

[13] *Ibid.* 92, 717D; 91, 858B.

[14] *Ibid.* 91, 343A; 447C; 858B; 952C; 92, 719A; 94, 146C; 150A; 151C; 180D.

If Bede allows, elsewhere, for a real content in the Sacrament in the Ambrosian sense,[2] he does not teach that the eucharistic body comes into being through the medium of a change of elements. The eucharistic body is consecrated (*consecratur*) or prepared (*conficitur*),[3] and Geiselmann points out that he ignores those sections of Ambrose's writings where the theory of the change is taught, and where the terms *mutare*, *transmutare*, and *convertere* are used.[4] He describes rather a spiritual change which is spiritually discerned.[5] When explaining the sacramental process, he does not press beyond the admission that the elements are changed into a sacrament of Christ's body and blood.[6] Early realism did not always perceive the logical implication of its doctrine. It was often rather consubstantiationist than transubstantiationist in tendency. Geiselmann concludes that Bede's Eucharistic teaching is fundamentally based upon Augustine. Although it was influenced by the doctrine of the real presence emphasised in the Gelasian and Gregorian liturgies, it also revealed the "dynamic-spiritual tendency" of Augustine. Bede was the first Western writer to combine the two strands of teaching into a composite system.[7]

In the interval between Gregory the Great and Bede the liturgies were in process of formation. In the Gallic and Spanish service books the influence of Ambrose was most prominent,[8] while in the Roman liturgies (Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian), although the teaching of Ambrose is clearly perceptible, yet Augustinian symbolism left its mark.[9]

---

[1] Migne, 91, 341C; 367B; 492D.

[2] *Ibid*. 92, 597D, etc.

[3] *Ibid*. 94, 118A; 658B.

[4] P. 52.

[5] *Ibid*. 92, 596B; spiritaliter immutata . . . ad spiritalem observantiam transferenda.

[6] *Ibid*. 94, 75A; panis et vini creatura in *sacramentum* carnis et sanguinis ejus . . . transfertur.

[7] P. 54f. Rückert, p. 27 arrives at a similar conclusion, also Loofs, p. 63. Schröckh, xx. 165, cannot decide upon Bede's teaching.

[8] Geiselmann, p. 19 ff.

[9] *Ibid*. pp. 28 ff. Martin Rule, *J.T.S.*, xii, 413 ff., holds that "transformare" in the liturgies="to symbolise" in the Greek sense of μεταμορφοῦν and μετασχηματίζειν. He disagrees with Feltoe (*ibid*. pp. 515 ff.) who sees in it an approximation to Transubstantiation.

Batiffol draws attention to the influence of Augustine in Spain during this era,[1] where Isidore of Seville was teaching. Throughout the ensuing period both strands of doctrine continued in operation,[2] although the influence of Augustine steadily increased, and issued in the first eucharistic controversy of Carolingian days.[3]

The prominent place given to Augustinian teaching during the Carolingian period was not uninfluenced by the reaction of the West against doctrinal tendencies in the East. At the second Council of Nicaea (787) image-worship was officially upheld by the eastern Church. Charles the Great criticised the iconodulic decrees of Nicaea, and secured their condemnation at the Council of Frankfurt (794). At Nicaea also the sacramental teaching of John of Damascus, who probably died before the Council assembled, was formally adopted. In the *De Fide Orthodoxa* John of Damascus completely identified the consecrated elements with the body and blood of Christ, and suggested that the eucharistic body was the historical body of Jesus. He defined the change as a transformation, by a process of assumption, of the elements into the body and blood of Christ, on the analogy of the Incarnation,[4] and adopted the terms μεταποιεῖν and μεταβάλλειν,[5] which had been used by Gregory of Nyssa.[6]

Meanwhile, in the West, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was not formulated for nearly three centuries. Autpertus (or Ansbertus), Abbot of S. Vincent[7] (*c*. 780), while referring to the visible signs and the invisible thing (*signa . . . res*), yet denied the actual (*in veritate*) presence of the body and blood of Christ, which he describes as sacraments (*sacra-*

[1] *L'Eucharistie* (1905), p. 349. [2] *Ibid.* p. 347.

[3] *Cf.* Nägle, pp. 53 f., 147.

[4] Loofs, p. 57 (Hauck-Herzog *Realencyclopädie*, i. (1896), Harnack, iv. 302 f.; Steitz, xii. 216, 275 ff; Schröckh, xx. 170.

[5] *De Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 13. (Migne, 94, 1145A.)

[6] This definition remained in use in the East throughout the greater part of the middle ages. It began to give way to the western notion of Transubstantiation at the Council of Lyons (1274), and the term μετουσίωσις was accepted by the representatives of the eastern Church at the Council of Florence (1439), although probably not in the definite sense in vogue in the West. *Cf.* Steitz, ix. 410 f. For the development of the doctrine in the East between Gregory of Nyssa and John of Damascus, *cf.* Steitz, x.–xii. In xiii. he sketches its history to the beginning of the fourteenth century.

[7] Rückert, p. 35; *cf.* Mabillon *Annales*, ii. (1704), 246 f.

menta).[1] That which we now receive in a sacrament one day we shall receive actually (*in veritate*).[2] More clearly does the symbolic interpretation appear in a letter of Charles the Great,[3] whose interest in theology surpassed that of most lay magnates of history. Writing to Alcuin he says that Christ broke the bread and gave the cup as a symbol (*in figuram*) of His body and blood.[4] The bread and the cup, like the chrism and penance, are great mysteries.[5] A similar view is expressed in the *Capitulary* of Ahito,[6] Bishop of Basel and Abbot of Reichenau (d. 836). He compares the "mystery" of the Eucharist with the mysteries of Baptism and Confirmation. In the mystery of the Sacrament visible creatures are seen, but an invisible salvation is ministered to the soul for eternity. The content of the Eucharist is not "body," but "salvation," which does not supply a corporal benefit to the soul. Salvation or the sacramental content is accepted by faith.

Leidrad, Archbishop of Lyons (799–813), repeated the comparison between the Eucharist and Baptism and Confirmation in a lengthy discussion in his *Liber de Sacramento Baptismi*, and he brings out the distinction between the external sacrament and the internal virtue.[7] Baptism supplies the external water and the internal effect of ablution; Confirmation has the external anointing of the Chrism, and the internal sanctification; the Eucharist has the external body and blood of the Lord (*corpus et sanguis Domini*) and the internal life. The body and blood are the bread and wine, which remain in the Sacrament, and are distinct from the inward life which they bring to the recipient. No more complete statement of Augustinian thought could have been produced.

In a letter of Maxentius, Patriarch of Aquileia (811–833), addressed to Charles the Great, the writer says that the eating of the body of the Lord consists in abiding in the presence of Christ through grace, but in addition to this

---

[1] Rückert, p. 33. [2] *Ibid.* p. 35.

[3] The *Libri Carolini* (Migne, 98, 1005 ff.) were written by Alcuin (*cf.* H. Bastgen, *Neues Archiv.* xxxvi-xxxvii, Hanover, 1911–1912). Alcuin was one of the few realist writers of the early Caroling period, although Rückert, 31 f. thinks that privately he was inclined to Augustine's teaching.

[4] Migne, 98, 913B. [5] *Ibid.* 98, 913A. [6] *Ibid.* 105, 763B.

[7] *Ibid.* 99, 867B–D.

Augustinian conception he speaks of a reception of the body and blood of Christ for the remission of sins.[1]

Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans and Abbot of Fleury (d. 821), also discusses the Eucharist at the end of a work on Baptism,[2] but he makes use of a different strand in Augustine's teaching. The Sacrament produces a mystical union with Christ. In the Eucharist there is a passing into the body of Christ. The mixing of wine and water represent in a symbolical manner the unity of Christ and the Church.[3] But that he offers no realist significance in this statement is shown by his application of a similar interpretation to Baptism. The elements of bread and wine become symbolical agents for the impartation of grace. Bread is offered to signify (*propter*) the living bread, which came down from heaven, and wine to represent physically the true vine.[4] Through consecration the bread and wine receive the dignity (*dignitas*) of the body and blood of Christ.[5]

Jonas of Orleans (d. 843), while referring to the visible miracle effected by the ministry of the priest, and the invisible miracle effected through consecration by the Lord, says that the presence of Christ depends upon the condition of the recipient.[6]

The dynamic symbolism of Theodulf was developed by Candidus of Fulda (d. after 865). In his treatise on the Passion of the Lord, Candidus says that the bread, together with the procedure of the Eucharist are symbolical of the historical and of the mystical body of Christ. He makes use of the Incarnation as an illustration. As Christ took human nature, and so freed Adam from the curse, so He took the bread and imparted to it a blessing. The bread is also the body of Christ which He took from His mystical body the Church. The fraction of the bread symbolises the suffering on the Cross, and its distribution to the disciples signifies the command to teach all people. We eat this bread when we become one bread and one body of which Christ is the head.

To a sacramental content of the bread and wine Candidus makes no reference. The eucharistic body and blood represent Christ's body and soul, for the blood is the symbol of His soul.[1] So that the reception of the cup conveys not the blood of Christ, but His life or spirit, which purifies us from sin, when we drink the blood through the impartation of His spirit. The bread also, as in the teaching of Cyprian, symbolises the Church, for as the bread is made by the pounding together of many grains of corn, and by fire, so the Church consists of many members, torn by troubles, passing through death to life.[2] In the symbolism of Candidus the stress is laid not on the body and blood of Christ, but rather upon the soul of Christ as the agent of our salvation.

---

[1] Migne 106, 52D.
[2] *Ibid.* 105, 239C.
[3] *Ibid.* 105, 239C, f.
[4] *Ibid.* 105, 240A.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid.* 106, 202D.

Christian Druthmar (*c.* 850) described the Eucharist as a love-token, left behind by the Lord, when He went on His distant journey, and every time the Sacrament is celebrated the love-token is again symbolically conferred.[3] No better symbols than bread and wine could have been chosen. The blood of Christ is symbolised (*figuratur*) in the wine,[4] and that spiritual bread strengthens the heart of man and places in it the sacrament of His love in whom we move and have our being.[5] Druthmar speaks not of a spiritual transference of the body into the bread, but on the contrary, of the wine into the blood of Christ,[6] and by transposing subject and object in the first clause of the formula, he may be striving to avoid the notion of a change of the elements, for he says definitely that the body and blood only exist in a sacramental sense.[7] There is no physical eating of the flesh; the feeding takes place through the mystical union existing between Christ and the believer.[8] But grace is actually mediated by the sacramental symbols.[9] No more spiritual interpretation of eucharistic symbolism appeared in the ninth century than in the teaching of this beautiful writer.[10] Geiselmann thinks that Druthmar repeats the Alexandrian theology of Augustine's earlier years.[11]

More use was made of Alexandrian mysticism by John

[1] Migne. 106, 69C quod sanguis illa animae Christi figuram tenet.

[2] *Ibid.* 106, 69B.

[3] *Ibid.* 106, 1476C semper hoc in figura facerent, quod pro eis acturus erat.

[4] *Ibid.* 106, 1476D. [5] *Ibid.* 1476B.

[6] *Ibid.* 1476D, transferens spiritualiter corpus in panem (or panem in corpus—Geiselmann, 134, n. 1.)

[7] *Ibid.* 106, 1476C. [8] *Ibid.* 1517C. [9] *Ibid.* 1476.

[10] Darwell Stone omits all reference to Druthmar and Candidus.

[11] P. 134.

Scotus Erigena (d. 877). In addition to being a scholar whose fame was as widely spread as that of Alcuin, John the Scot will always rank among the leading mediaeval philosophers. Much of his thought was in later days regarded as heretical by the Church. It is reported that at the Synod of Vercelli (1050), when Berenger was condemned, one of his books was burned. John the Scot was the Origen of the early mediaeval church. His mastery of Greek—he translated the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius—opened to him the realm of Greek thought, and he came under the influence of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonists. The Alexandrians played a larger part in the formation of his sacramental views than in those of Augustine, whose knowledge of Greek was small, and through him the eleventh century received the Neo-Platonic tradition.

It is probable that John the Scot did not write a special book on the Eucharist, and the book burned at Vercelli was almost certainly the work of Ratramn,[1] unless an unknown work of John, which contained sacramental teaching was then destroyed. But there are many places in his theological writings from which his ideas on the Eucharist may be gathered. Adopting the contrast between a cause and its effects, drawn by the Pseudo-Dionysius,[2] he taught that there is no real content in the Sacraments; they have a significance which is independent of themselves. On the other hand, they do not remain mere symbols (*remanentes in figuris*) otherwise they could not fasten the faculties of the mind on the mystical understanding of them.[3] Their purpose is to materialise mental concepts.[4] The sacraments of both Old and New Testaments were actual events, but their symbolical character sets them up as mysteries.[5] Yet, just because the Eucharist denotes (*significativa*) something which is independent of itself, it cannot be apprehended as an actuality in itself, but symbolises truth or Christ.[6]

So John the Scot conceives of sacramental symbolism as exerting a dynamic effect upon the participants. An experience mystical but actual is created by the mystic hosts (*mysticae hostiae*) of the New Testament. Baptism is no mere figure (*figura*); it is true (*verum*) so far as it effects salvation.[1] The water is received as a visible sacrament, as a symbol (*symbolum*) of Baptism, but the spirit is mentally apprehended through the symbol.[2] So the fallen nature of man is restored and deified by the blood of Christ.[3] We receive Christ spiritually in the Eucharist, not physically.[4] John the Scot distinguishes clearly between the material symbols and the spiritual Eucharist (*eucaristia*) which is prepared (*conformare, conficere*) in the Church.[5] There is also a twofold reception, one physical (*corporaliter accipere*), which is a symbolical similitude (*typicam similitudinem*) of the other or the spiritual participation in Jesus[6] by faith.[7] So the process of apotheosis of man through the Eucharist depends on his subjective condition. To the natural man the Sacrament remains mere barley-bread.[8] Human enlightenment, as the Neo-Platonists taught, thus takes place by means of the earthly lights, which are figures of the spiritual lights, and particularly of Him who was the true light, which lighteneth every man coming into the world.[9] Through the operation of grace a mystical union with God is attained, for human nature cannot reach God.[10] This union is effected by means of the descent of the wisdom of God, through grace, and by the exaltation of human nature to the same wisdom, through love—that is to say the enlightenment is effected through a Theophany (*Theophania*).[11]

---

[1] *Cf. Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine*, p. 231, n. 7.

[2] *Cf.* Steitz, xii. 214, for the theory of Pseudo-Dionysius. The teaching of Pseudo-Dionysius was spread in the East by Maximus the Confessor (*gest.* 669) *cf.* Steitz, xi. 230, and Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem (624) the teacher of Maximus (*ibid*, 238).

[3] Migne, 122, 170D; *cf.* 171A. [4] *Ibid.* 347A. [5] *Ibid.* 347f.

[6] *Ibid.* 140f.

Yet this process of salvation is not operated by Christ through a local or temporal presence in the Eucharist. It is effected by His divinity, for His flesh has returned to spirit, into God Himself,[12] and cannot be contained in any place, nor move in the flux of time, nor be compressed within form or sex.[13] The material symbols of the Eucharist do not, therefore, contain a real presence of Christ.[14] John the Scot's eucharistic teaching is closely related to the theology originated by Augustine, and although no mere imitation of Augustine, his doctrine was inspired by similar fundamental ideas derived from Neo-Platonism.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 309B–C. [2] *Ibid.* 316B–C.

[3] *Ibid.* 1222C. Sanguis mortales nos facit esse deos; *cf.* 1002B.

[4] *Ibid.* 311B. Intellectualiter mente, non dente.

[5] *Ibid.* 140B, 347A. [6] *Ibid.* 140B. [7] *Ibid.* 140C; *cf.* 347A.

[8] *Ibid.* 347B. [9] *Ibid.* 139B. [10] *Ibid.* 576B. [11] *Ibid.* 449B.

[12] *Ibid.* 993B. [13] *Ibid.* 894B-C, cf. 994A-B.

[14] Bach, *Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters*, i. (1873), 310 f., maintains that John taught the doctrine of the real presence.

Of fifteen writers, including Alcuin, between Germain of Paris and John the Scot, covering a period of about three hundred and fifty years, only five can be claimed for the realist interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist, and of these Bede also reproduced Augustinian teaching. But shortly before this strongly flowing stream of Evangelical tradition reached its fullest tide in the teaching of Ratramn, a powerful reaction was instituted by Paschasius Radbert, the monk and later Abbot of Corbey. His book *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, the first extensive treatise on eucharistic doctrine, was written in 831, but does not appear to have become known until it was sent to the Emperor Charles the Bald in 844. The previous history of eucharistic doctrine in the West, during the early middle ages, will have shown that Radbert's book, so far from being a statement of the prevailing interpretation of the doctrine, on the contrary, appeared as a protest against the general current of teaching, which apart from the liturgies, was being given in the strongholds of orthodoxy, the great Benedictine abbeys, in which several of these writers were trained.[2]

Radbert's great contribution was the complete identification of the sacramental body with the historical body of Christ,[3] an idea which was almost expressed by Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 638),[4] and John of Damascus. Paschasius also introduced another innovating notion—the conception of the new creation of the body of Christ at every Eucharist,[5] although the two ideas are reciprocally contradictory. On the other hand, Paschasius did not break away entirely from Augustine's influence. Like Isidore of Seville he described the Sacrament as a pledge (*figura*) of our salvation,[6] and he applies to the elements the terms figure (*figura*),[1] and similitude (*similitudo*).[2] Yet he is always careful to emphasise the real content of the symbolism,[3] and his treatise became a standard work among orthodox writers in the West during the pre-scholastic era, and attained an ascendancy similar to that of the *De Fide Orthodoxa* of John of Damascus in the East.[4]

---

[1] Geiselmann, p. 134 f. [2] *Cf.* Rückert, p. 50.

[3] Migne, 120, 1277A and D. Cf. Nägle, pp. 77 f., 182 etc. Geiselmann, pp. 160, 168.

[4] Steitz, xi. 243 f., contends that the realist conception of an actually present body of Christ appears first in the teaching of Sophronius, *Commentarius Liturgicus* cap. 3. Steitz, xii. 278, also more strongly emphasises the identification theory in the teaching of John of Damascus.

[5] Migne, 120, 1312B. *Cf.* 1277C, 1310C, 1311A, 1352B.

[6] *Ibid.* 1275A.

But Radbert's doctrine was immediately challenged by Ratramn, another member of his own monastery, which for fifty years had been a centre of Augustinian teaching.[5] The Emperor Charles the Bald commissioned Ratramn to write his book,[6] which was published 845–850, and the two terms of reference, given by the Emperor, indicate that he desired a reply to the teaching of Paschasius. The Emperor asked Ratramn whether the body and blood of Christ are received as a mystery perceptible to faith alone, or actually, so as to be visible to the eye. Secondly, is the sacramental body identical with that which was received by the Virgin Mary.[7]

Ratramn attacked the theory of Radbert at the centre by contending that Ambrose did not teach an actual, but a sacramental presence of Christ in the Eucharist, a view which in modern times has been expressed by Loofs.[8] If Ambrose had set up a real presence of Christ, he would have predicated the corruption and mortality of the body of Christ.[9] Nothing is more absurd than to receive the bread as flesh, and to call the wine, blood.[10] To conceive of an actual presence of the body and blood of Christ neutralises the function of faith,[11] and removes the mystery of the Eucharist.[12] The Sacrament is a mystery revealing one thing to the senses and another to the mind,[13] and he quotes Augustine's Epistle to Boniface in support of his contention that it is only relatively (*secundum quamdam modum*) the body and blood of Christ.[1] So there can be no identification between the sacramental and the historical body of Christ. The difference between the two is not small (*non parva differentia*),[2] but manifold. The eucharistic body is spiritual, whereas the historical body of Christ, which was crucified, was neither spiritual nor divine, and between the two there exists the difference common to all corporal and spiritual, visible and invisible, divine and human things.[3] The body which was born of the Virgin, was composed of bones and nerves, it was distinguished by human lineaments, and had a rational soul. The eucharistic body is made by human hands from grains of corn,[4] and so on.[5] Things which differ from each other cannot be the same.[6] The sacramental body is not corporal, but spiritual, and so cannot be visible and palpable. The historical body was real (*verum*), and even after the Resurrection remained visible and palpable.[7] Thus, as soon as it appeared, the identification theory of Radbert was contradicted.

---

[1] Migne 1279B, 1278A. [2] *Ibid.* 1315B. [3] *Ibid.* 1353A, etc.

[4] For a fuller account of Radbert's teaching, *cf.* *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine*, pp. 233 ff.

[5] Rückert, pp. 49 f., 518 f.

[6] Ratramn, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, Cap. 1 (Migne 121).

[7] Cap. 5. [8] P. 60.

[9] Ratramn, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, Cap. 59.

[10] Cap. 11. [11] Cap. 11. [12] Cap. 9.

[13] Cap. 9. Schnitzer, p. 169 ff., and to a less extent Harnack, v. 321, n. 1. think that the difference between Ratramn and Radbert is very small. Schnitzer finds both the real presence and Transubstantiation in Ratramn's teaching (p. 168; *cf.* 158 n. 1). So also the Catholic writer Nägle, pp. 247 ff., 252 ff.

The positive statement of Ratramn, describing the Eucharist as a spiritual mystery, hidden from the eye of the body, and perceptible only by the soul, springs from his theory of symbolism. In a discussion on the meaning of the terms "figura" and "veritas," he defines a figure as a covering, showing what it indicates by its wrappings, as when Christ said "I am the vine, ye are the branches," or "I am the bread of life."[8] Thus a figure or symbol shows by its outward form the process or reality which it signifies, and the bread and sacramental feeding indicate respectively, by their form and process, the spiritual body of Christ and spiritual communion. The terms bread, vine and branches do not indicate substantial realities.[9] "Veritas," on the other hand, is the clear enunciation of a thing, expressed, not in figurative but in unambiguous and open terms, to be understood in the plain and natural sense of the statement, with a bare and open significance, as when we say that Christ was born of the Virgin, suffered, was crucified, died and was buried.[1] The only substantial reality in the symbol is the substance which the bread and wine possessed before they were consecrated, and which they retain after consecration. They were bread and wine before consecration. and they exist in this species afterwards.[2] In the terminology of Ratramn "species" is equivalent to "substance," even when it appears to indicate a fundamental difference between the two, and his phraseology can only be consistently interpreted in this sense. He quotes Isidore in support of his contention that the substance of bread and wine remains after the elements are consecrated.[3] The bread is present in its form, colour, and flavour,[4] and the wine is seen in the substance of wine.[5]

---

[1] Cap. 35. [2] Cap. 97. [3] Cap. 71. [4] Cap. 72.
[5] Cap. 73–5. [6] Cap. 76. [7] Cap. 62.
[8] Cap. 7. Figura est obumbratio quaedam quibusdam velaminibus quod intendit ostendens. . . . Haec enim omnia aliud dicunt et aliud innuunt.
[9] Cap. 8.

To complete the statement he quotes Augustine's distinction between the symbol and the thing signified—the "res" and the "res sacramenti." The sacramental content or reality is not the body of Christ actually present as a spiritual substance, covered by the material accidence of bread and wine. The elements are only figuratively said to be the body and blood of Christ, and if Ratramn speaks of a change (*commutatio*) into the spiritual body and blood of Christ, which exist beneath the covering of the corporal species of bread and wine, he is careful to explain that he means a change into the potency (*potentiam*) or "mysteries" of the spiritual body and blood.[6] The terminology, he contends, is to be understood only in a spiritual manner.[7] No contrast between substance and accidence occupies a place in his thought.[8] On the other hand Ratramn's symbolism is not a mere representative theory. Consecration supplies the elements with the potency, virtue and power of the Word now latent in the consecrated symbols;[9] it produces in them the efficacy or life of the body of Christ.[10] The actual body of Christ is a heavenly divine thing[11] remote from human perception.[12] Being life it conveys immortality to the receiver,[13] but in the form of grace or virtue of which the agent is Christ. The life so conveyed is spiritual potency, invisible efficacy, divine virtue,[1] and he uses language reminiscent of Ignatius. If we consider what inwardly purges, it is life-giving virtue (*virtus vitalis*), the virtue of sanctification, the virtue of immortality. Healing virtue is in the mystery.[2]

---

[1] Cap. 8. [2] Cap. 54. [3] Cap. 40, 43. [4] Cap. 9, 12, 14.
[5] Cap. 10. [6] Cap. 16. [7] Cap. 74, 75.
[8] Geiselmann, p. 212, but Schnitzer, p. 162, n. 1 sees a theory of accidence in his teaching.
[9] Cap. 56, non in specie, sed in virtute. *Cf.* cap. 26; cap. 54, interius latentem virtutem; cap. 22, potestas Verbi.
[10] Cap. 52. [11] Cap. 9. [12] Cap. 4, 9. [13] Cap. 19.

Ratramn was under the influence of the Platonic dualism between appearance and idea on the one hand, and body and soul on the other,[3] inspired probably by the teaching of John the Scot, which Ratramn handed on to Berengar. But whereas Geiselmann finds in his teaching dualism within the Sacrament, so that the Eucharist may be interpreted as material elements and a spiritual content, the traces of Platonic thought in his work suggest rather a contrast between the Sacrament and the Risen personality of Christ,—the consecrated elements symbolise the absent Christ—a view similar to that of Origen.[4] Consequently there is no foundation for metabolism or Transubstantiation in his teaching, although most of the terms used by Ambrosian metabolists appear.[5] In one passage he says that a change of the bread and wine takes place spiritually (*spiritualiter*) through the omnipotent virtue of God, into the flesh of Christ's body and into the stream of His own blood.[6] But this language was a mere imitation of the phraseology of the sacramentaries, and may have been written under the influence of Ambrose. Ratramn's theory of substance[7] could hardly have been held side by side with a theory of Transubstantiation. When he uses the term "substance" of material things, it refers to their physical composition, and he maintains that the sacramental elements retain their physical substance after consecration.[8] When he uses it of an invisible thing it describes the invisible potency or virtue of the Divine Word, designated the body of Christ, which feeds and sanctifies the minds of the faithful.[1] Quoting Augustine,[2] and possibly John the Scot, he says that we feed by the mind and not by the teeth,[3] a statement which is Alexandrian and Origenist, and he says that the Sacraments are so called because, by the covering (*tegumento*) of material things, the divine virtue (*virtus divina*) mysteriously (*secretius*) dispenses health to those receiving with faith.[4] So also, the terms "veritas" and "natura" are used, not of a substantial body of Christ, but of the inward virtue of the Sacrament,[5] and he contrasts "veritas" with "essentia" as the spiritual "thing," and its material appearance.[6] The Aristotelian conception of substance, which emphasises a distinction between substance and its mode of appearance, is not used by him. He inclines rather to an empirical valuation of the concepts of substance, nature, essence, truth which are simply characterised as "things."[7]

---

[1] Cap. 72. Quidquid enim in ea vitae praebet substantiam, spiritualis est potentiae et invisibilis efficientiae, divinaeque virtutis.

[2] Cap. 18.

[3] Geiselmann, p. 200. Dem Ganzen liegt der platonisch Dualismus zwischen Erscheinung und Idee einerseits, zwischen Körper und Seele auderseits zugrunde.

[4] Rückert, p. 545 f., describes him as an Origenist, without possessing the views of Origen. But Ratramn follows Origen by defining the sacramental content as the potency of the divine Word (cap. 49 and *supra* p. 97, n. 9). Rückert concludes that he is neither metabolist nor symbolist.

[5] Cap. 15, mutatio; cap. 14 demutatio; cap. 12–14 permutatio; cap. 54 commutari; cap. 56 permutari; cap. 25, 28, 30 convertere; cap. 12 transitur.

[6] Cap. 25.

[7] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 211 f.

[8] Cap. 54 secundum creaturarum substantiam, quod fuerant ante consecratione, hoc et postea consistunt.

Moreover, while Ratramn refers to the Pseudo-Augustinian *Ten Categories of Aristotle*, he does not make use of it in his interpretation of the Eucharist.[8] There is no change (*permutatio*) in the Sacrament from non-existence into existence, for the bread and wine already existed before they experienced a change (of potency) after consecration.[9] There is no change from what exists into non-existence, for the species of bread and wine remain the same as they were before.[10] Nor is there a qualitative or substantial change in the philosopic sense, for the elements reveal no change to the senses of touch, sight or taste.[11] Whatever change takes place[12] refers not to substance or appearance, but to the value or effective virtue of the elements.[13] Following Isidore's analogy, drawn from Baptism and Confirmation, he says that consecration produces in the sacramental elements the virtue of sanctification and the vigour of life,[14] the change is not material but spiritual, and is necessarily said to be figurative (*necesse est jam ut figurata facta esse dicatur*).[1] The bread is prepared (*conficitur*) as the body of Christ,[2] the wine is made the sacrament of His blood.[3] "So did Ratramn develop the deposit of the Augustinian teaching, and prepare the ground for Berengar."[4] This estimate of the effect of Ratramn on Berengar's doctrine has also been made by Batiffol,[5] and several other writers, both Catholic and Protestant. From the year 1559 until 1900 Ratramn's book remained on the Index.

---

[1] Cap. 49 corpus et sanguis Christi . . . figurae sunt secundum speciem visibilem: at vero secundum invisibilem substantiam corpus et sanguis Christi existunt . . . juxta vero potentioris virtutem substantiae, fidelium mentes et pascant et sanctificant.

[2] *In Joan Tract.* xxvi. 12. [3] Cap. 79, 89. [4] Cap. 48.

[5] Cap. 77, 78, 83. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 214 f. [6] Cap. 12–15.

[7] Geiselmann, p. 215. On the modified influence of Aristotle on Ratramn, *cf.* Nägle, p. 238.

[8] Geiselmann, p. 205 f. [9] Cap. 12. [10] Cap. 12. [11] Cap. 13.

[12] Cap. 15. [13] Cap. 56. [14] Cap. 17.

Ratramn was only one of several contemporary writers who criticised the doctrine of Paschasius, a fact admitted by Paschasius himself.[6] Among them was Rabanus Maurus[7] (d. 856), the Bishop of Mainz. His sacramental teaching is scattered throughout many theological writings. The orthodoxy of Rabanus has not been questioned by most Catholic writers,[8] but while the doctrine of the real presence is expressed in some of his terminology,[9] yet when compared with the rest of his eucharistic teaching, and especially when read in view of his antipathy to the ideas of Paschasius, it is doubtful whether he does more than make use of the phraseology of contemporary realists; and even if Rabanus can be shown to be orthodox, in a realist sense, his criticism of Paschasius brings out into stronger light the innovating character of that writer's system.

With Ratramn, Rabanus refused to identify the sacramental body of Christ with the historical body.[10] As Augustine taught, he says, the consecrated elements are a sign.[11] After consecration the bread and wine remain,[12] so that metabolism is excluded, although he uses the terms "convertere,"[1] and "transire."[2] The consecrated elements have a mystical value; they produce a mystic effect upon the recipient;[3] for example, they unite the believing worshipper with Christ,[4] and signify in a mystical way the Passion.[5] But mere reception does not make men good, the personal effect produced by the Sacrament depends on the subjective condition of the receiver.[6]

---

[1] Cap. 16. [2] Cap. 9.

[3] Cap. 10, vinum, quod Christi sanguinis efficitur sacramentum.

[4] Geiselmann, p. 217; *cf.* pp. 281, 283.

[5] P. 440, n. 1. Some writers, *e.g.* De la Taille *Mysterium Fidei*, p. 624, n. 2, and Darwell Stone i. 233, can arrive at no definite conclusion on Ratramn's teaching.

[6] Migne, 120, 1357D; *cf.* 1356D.

[7] On the authorship of the *Epistle to Egilo*, *cf.* my *Berengar*, p. 241, n. 4.

[8] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 105.

[9] *Cf.* Migne, 108, 488A; 112, 105B; 107, 316B ff.

[10] *Ibid.* 110, 493A, although in 108, 493B he appears to suggest a mystical identification.

[11] *Ibid.* 110, 269C; 112, 88C ff., although here the symbolism of the Old Testament parallels receives more stress. But Rabanus' symbolism comes out clearly in Migne 111, 133A (aliquid significari intelligitur). He quotes Isidore "sub tegumento corporalium," *cf. supra* p. 86, n. 4.

[12] *Ibid.* 107, 324D f.

Moreover, his teaching on the sacramental process or the effect of consecration only vaguely suggests the idea of the real presence. If he speaks of visible matter (*materia*) and an "invisible thing,"[7] the latter is explained as the sacramental virtue (*virtus*)[8]—a symbolist interpretation, which draws the Augustinian-Platonic contrast between "matter" and "thing."[9] After consecration the bread "has for us" the effect of the body of Christ,[10] the bread and wine pass into the "sacrament" (*sacramentum*) of body and blood.[11]

Like some other writers, Rabanus wavers between symbolist ideas and realist language. He draws a comparison between the body of Christ extended on the Cross, and the consecrated body extended on the altar, and implies that both are present in the Eucharist,[12] yet this is scarcely the later theory of Consubstantiation, it is rather an illustration than the expression of a theory. Dynamic symbolism, rather than Ambrosian realism, lies behind his ideas. If his sacramental symbolism includes an actual effect produced upon the recipient by communion, it does not create the objective presence of Christ, still less does it allow for the change of bread and wine into the body and blood. Rückert concluded that Rabanus' teaching was fundamentally symbolical, but like Alcuin, he held this view privately, and frequently used realist language in his writings.[13]

Yet the doctrine of Paschasius Radbert had clearly made an impression in his own age. It accounts for the wavering dualism of other writers besides Rabanus. Dualism in eucharistic doctrine dates back to the days of Irenaeus, but the confused hesitancy between the two main strands of sacramental teaching, which characterises the teaching of several writers in the second half of the ninth century, should be attributed to the disturbance caused by the Paschasian theory, when thrown across the Augustinian tradition, rather than to any attempt to force the teachings of Ambrose and Augustine, or to revive the dualism of Irenaeus and the Antiochenes. Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), a pupil of Rabanus Maurus, defined the Sacrament as a "figure" of the body of Christ in the bread and wine.[1] Geiselmann interprets this statement as the old Gallic idea, not of a change of the elements into body and blood, but of the latter into bread and wine.[2] However, Walafrid does not deny the existence of the substance of the elements after consecration. Christ gives His flesh and blood in the substance of bread and wine,[3] and if Walafrid also speaks of the true body and blood of Christ,[4] he does not identify the sacramental content with the historical body of Christ.

---

[1] Migne, 109, 992B. [2] *Ibid.* 107, 319A.

[3] *Ibid.* 110, 492D; 108, 493B; 107, 224A; 112, 103C.

[4] *Ibid.* 107, 317A–C; 112, 103A.

[5] *Ibid.* 107, 319C, 1106C; 112, 822C, 1179A; 108, 502D.

[6] *Ibid.* 110, 293B; 107, 321B. [7] *Ibid.* 107, 317B, D.

[8] *Ibid.* 108, 493B; 111, 133A. [9] Geiselmann, p. 116.

[10] Migne, 112, 1186D, corpus tuum, quod de hoc pane fieri credimus . . . hunc panem, ut corpus tuam fiat . . . ut nobis corpus tuum et sanguis tuus fiat.

[11] *Ibid.* 109, 992B; 107, 319A. [12] *Ibid.* 107, 324D. [13] P. 524.

The state of flux of eucharistic thought in the middle of the ninth century is shown by the difficulty of classifying the writers of that period and the succeeding decades. Rückert describes Amalry, the deacon of Lyons (d. *c.* 850) as a symbolist;[5] Geiselmann, while allowing that symbolism appears in his teaching, places him among the metabolists.[6] In his own day Amalry's symbolism appears to have been approved by the symbolist Rabanus,[7] but was criticised by the realists Agobard[8] (d. 840) and Florus[9] (d. 860), both of Lyons. Amalry says that the Eucharist is not a mere memorial of the Passion, but a figure or similitude or imitation of it in a sacramental manner.[10] The content of the sacramental offering is bread and wine and water,[11] and these signify (*signant*) the Lord's body;[12] they are a "sacred sign" in the Augustinian sense.[1] If he describes the sacramental process as a change of the simple nature (*simplicem naturam*) of the bread and wine into the rational (*rationabilem*) nature of the body and blood,[2] this is hardly Ambrosian realism, and still less Radbertian, and he cannot break away from the old Gallic notion, which sought to retain the elements of the bread and wine, by describing a change of the flesh and blood into the substance of bread and wine.[3]

---

[1] Migne, 114, 231C; figurans corpus suum in pane; 338B, in panis et vini figura.

[2] P. 124 f.

[3] *Ibid.* 114, 936C, in panis et vini substantia.

[4] *Ibid.* 114, 937D.

[5] Pp. 37, 40.

[6] Pp. 87 ff.

[7] Geiselmann, p. 107, mentions the dependence of Rabanus (*De Cler. Inst.*, i, 33) on Amalry (*De Eccles. Offic.* iii, 35).

[8] Migne, 105, 1334B; *cf.* 1141A.

[9] *Ibid.* 119, 71 f.

[10] *Ibid.* 105, 989A; *cf.* 1335A, 1138B.

[11] *Ibid.* 105, 989A; *cf.* 1141C.

[12] *Ibid.* 105, 1144D.

In a less pronounced, but still appreciable degree, Augustine's symbolism appears, as a kind of separate strand in the teaching of Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt[4] (d. 853), Florus of Lyons,[5] Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims[6] (d. 882), and Remi, Bishop of Auxerre[7] (in a work written *c.* 908). The strength of the Augustinian tradition, although now in conflict with Ambrosian realism, which was reinforced by the growing popularity of Radbert's doctrine, is perhaps more clearly illustrated by its presence in the teaching of these realist writers than in the work of the symbolists. But the writers of the second half of the ninth century also revealed another tendency, which, operating side by side with the teaching of Paschasius, assisted in the eclipse of Augustianism in eucharistic theory two hundred years later. The old Gallic idea of a change of the body and blood of Christ into the bread and wine, as an explanation of the Ambrosian metabolism, had merely stated the fact of the sacramental change or conversion, without defining it, and failed to meet the requirements of the Carolingian defenders of realism, although it can be traced in the teaching of Haymo.[8] The identification theory of Paschasius was, as yet, too advanced for some writers. In the teaching of Haymo of Halberstadt and Remi of Auxerre an attempt was made to find in the Godhead a principle of unity between the sacramental body of Christ and the historical body.[9] This conception avoids the notion of an identification or equation of the sacramental body with the historical, and rests content with the union of the two, side by side, in the Eucharist.[1]

---

[1] Migne 105, 1138C. [2] *Ibid.* 105, 1141A. [3] *Ibid.* 105, 1141A, 1334B.
[4] Geiselmann, pp. 256 ff. [5] *Ibid.* p. 104. [6] *Ibid.* pp. 90 ff.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 176. [8] *Ibid.* p. 257 f.

[9] Haymo (Migne 117, 572C) panis . . . cum virtute divinitatis, quae illum replet panem, verum corpus Christi est. *Cf.* 564C; Remi (Migne, 101, 1260D) Divinitas enim Verbi . . . replet illud . . . ita conjungatur corpori Christi et unum corpus sit in veritate (from the *De Celebratione Missae* printed in Migne as Cap. xl of the *De Divinis Officiciis* of Pseudo Alcuin. *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 171 ff.

By the beginning of the tenth century, the Carolingian discussion on the Eucharist had come to rest, and no writings on the Sacrament have been handed down from the first half of the century, except, perhaps, the anonymous *Responsio cujusdam de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*[2] and the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* of Gezo of Tortona.[3] For the second half of the century the works of four writers have been preserved—Atto of Vercelli, Rather of Verona, Heriger of Lobbes and Aelfric. In each of them, with the exception of Rather of Verona, who taught a doctrine of Consubstantiation, the symbolist interpretation predominates.

Atto of Vercelli (d. 961), without criticising the realist position, describes the bread and wine as signifying the body and soul, which are saved by sacramental communion.[4] His teaching recalls the idea of Ignatius. The substance of salvation is imparted to the receiver in the bread and wine,[5] which are not described as undergoing a change, but are signs of the life-giving value of the body and blood.[6]

At the close of the century the new theory of Haymo and Remi received more definite formulation from Heriger of Lobbes[7] (d. 1007), who found the principle of unity, not vaguely in the "divinity" or the Word, but in the glorified humanity of the Son, and again the complete identification theory of Radbert was avoided. The sacramental body is united with the historical body, but only through the glorified but non-personal humanity,[8] in contrast with the theory of Rather of Verona, who emphasised the presence of the personal Logos in the Eucharist,[9] which was a return to Alexandrian teaching. The historical and sacramental bodies are not simply one body, they are only identical in nature,[1] not in substance. But so far as this notion implies a contrast between the mystical-sacramental body and the historical,[2] Heriger balances it with the idea that they are not simply different, but only in a special sense derived from their external appearance[3] and he retains the Augustinian conception of the consecrated elements as symbols (*figura*), but symbols of a real content, "representative bearers" of the body of Christ, and not mediating symbols in the Ratramnian sense.[4] Thus, for the time being, Heriger had synthesised realism and symbolism, but his hardly-won achievement only throws into stronger light the persistency of the Augustinian tradition in conflict with a powerful current of realism. Geiselmann concludes that in the *Epistle to Egilo* at least, Heriger stands closer to Ratramn than to Radbert, to Augustine than to Ambrose.[5]

---

[1] Geiselmann, p. 173.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 263.
[3] Migne, 137, 369 ff.
[4] *Ibid.* 134, 380A. Per panem corpus, per vinum animam signatur.
[5] *Ibid.* 134, 758A, vivificatricem substantiam atque salutarem in pane et vino.
[6] Geiselmann, p. 267.
[7] *Ibid,* pp. 229 ff., 269 ff.
[8] Migne, 139, 187A-B (printed among the works of Gerbert). The same conception appears in the anonymous *Dicta cujusdam de corp. et Sang. Dom.* (Migne, 112, 1517D) which Geiselmann, p. 229, dates in the middle of the ninth century. Morin (*Rev. bénédict.* 1908, 14 f.) assigns it to Heriger.
[9] Geiselmann, p. 262.

Our survey has shown that in the tenth century and at the beginning of the eleventh, the interpreters of the Eucharist in a dynamic-symbolist sense still outnumbered those who made realism the central theme of their exposition. This is especially noticeable in the writings of the English Aelfric, Abbot of Cerne in Dorset and then of Eynsham in Oxfordshire. Up to the middle of the tenth century the revival of realism by Paschasius Radbert does not appear to have influenced the Saxon clergy, but an attempt was made by Oda, Archbishop of Canterbury (942-959), who was trained at the Benedictine Abbey of Fleury, to correct the prevalent English view that the consecrated elements were symbols (*figura*) of the body and blood of Christ, and did not undergo a change in the Sacrament.[6] One day Oda prayed for a miracle in order to influence the minds of the clergy who were present. When the bread was broken, portions of the flesh and blood, so the story says, were seen clinging to the Archbishop's fingers, and when the clergy were thereby convinced of the reality of the body and blood, the miraculous portents were transformed back into bread and wine at Oda's petition.[1] The legend illustrates the zeal of the Benedictine reformers to revive ancient Ambrosian teaching in the English Church, and to introduce Radbertian doctrine; but the attempt failed, for the writings of Aelfric, a generation later, which had a wide and popular circulation through both north and south of the country, show that the Paschasian realism had obtained, so far, no footing in the Saxon Church, and that, on the contrary, the doctrine of Ratramn was readily received. Among an illiterate and decadent clergy, whose illiteracy confirmed their conservative views, the Ratramnian teaching would have gained no widespread assent if it had been regarded as an innovation.

---

[1] Migne, 112, 1518C; simul una est naturaliter caro dans, data, accipiens (*cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 236, 277. Migne prints the passage among the epistles of Rabanus Maurus).

[2] Geiselmann, p. 237.

[3] Migne, 112, 1517D (*cf.* 139, 182C) aliud specialiter corpus Christi . . . quod sedet ad dexteram Dei et aliud specialiter istud quod divinitus creatur et consecratur quotidie novam, simul tamen non duo sunt (quod absit) corpora sed unum.

[4] *Ibid.* 139, 182C, figura est dum panis extra videtur, veritas autem dum corpus et sanguis Christi in veritate creditur; 182B haec dici figurate et tamen corpus Christi esse in veritate.

[5] P. 240f., *cf.* pp. 238ff. for Augustine's influence on Heriger.

[6] Migne, 133, 939B; Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta* (Nova. edit.), pp. 495ff.

Aelfric's popularity as a writer and preacher was well-established before Wulfsin, Bishop of Sherborne (993–1001) and Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards of York (d. 1023) requested him to write pastoral letters for the clergy under their charge.[2] Aelfric drew up several pastorals, or *Canons*, among them the *Sermon on the Sacrifice of Easter Day*,[3] which was widely read in his own day and in later times in England. He draws a contrast between the mystery of the eucharistic body and the actual or true body of Christ.[4] The sacramental body is a pledge or symbol of the true body, to which we shall come when life is over,[5] and he clearly distinguishes between the historical and sacramental bodies of Christ.[6]

After consecration the elements of the bread and wine remain, and are still corruptible.[7] Consecration "hallows,"[8] it does not change, it produces "ghostly might" in the elements, and this gives immortality to the recipient.[9] Although he speaks of the "substance of life" given in the "housel," this is defined as "a ghostly power and efficacy," and is called a "mystery" because one thing is seen, while another is "understood,"[1] and when he says that after the hallowing the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, he is careful to explain that his language is symbolical and mystical.

---

[1] A shorter account appears in William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum* (Rolls Series, No. 52, p. 25).

[2] On Aelfric's identity and writings *cf. Berengar*, pp. 246 ff.

[3] B. Thorpe, *Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ii (1840), 263 ff.

[4] Thorpe, ii. 269, 271. [5] *Ibid.* 273. [6] *Ibid.* 271.

[7] *Ibid.* 271 [8] *Ibid.* 269. [9] *Ibid.* 273.

No less than nineteen passages are taken almost verbatim from nineteen chapters in Ratramn's book;[2] and since Aelfric's works were still being copied in England as late as 1080,[3] it is clear that the Augustinian-Ratramnian symbolism was prevalent in England until the appearance of Lanfranc ensured the victory of Radbert's doctrine in the English Church.

But the teaching of Aelfric created no corresponding revival of dynamic symbolism on the Continent during the eleventh century; that work was left to a more famous name; yet the Augustinian tradition continued. Whether it played any part in the teaching of the sectaries who were burned at Orleans (1022) and Arras (1025) is unknown. It may have influenced the synthesis of symbolism and realism, similar to that of Heriger of Lobbes, drawn up by Gerard of Cambrai (d. 1051) in order to check the theories of the Arras sectaries.[4] It can be traced in the writings of Fulbert of Chartres (d. 1028). Fulbert maintained the Ratramnian distinction between the sacramental and historical bodies of Christ.[5] The elements of bread and wine remain after consecration,[6] which produces a higher value.[7] Yet he also says that the sacramental elements become inwardly (*interius*) the body of Christ,[8] and that the earthly materials (*terrena materies*) are changed into the substance of Christ.[9] Although this does not express the later theory of Transubstantiation—for he refers to a change into the substance of Christ, not of the body of Christ, and he retained the substance of bread and wine—yet metabolism influenced his thought. But his refusal to admit a disappearance of the elements may have first drawn the attention of Berengar to this important truth, just as his insistence on the presence of the body of Christ indicated the growing influence of Paschasian teaching. It was the rapid spread of Radbert's doctrine, especially in the Benedictine houses, where it had first been regarded as an innovation, that gave to Berengar's teaching in the middle of the eleventh century a misleading appearance. To minds not steeped in the early history of the doctrine, minds which had been inspired for two or three generations by the Radbertian doctrine, Berengar's teaching appeared to be novel. Yet it was in reality a simple return to the true line of development in the West, to the dynamic symbolism of Augustine which had stemmed for centuries the influence of Ambrosian realism and metabolism.

---

[1] Thorpe, ii 271.

[2] The Ratramnian passages are quoted in *Berengar*, p. 249, n. 5.

[3] B. Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe Aelfrics* (1914), Introduction p. xv.

[4] Geiselmann, pp. 284 ff. [5] Migne, 141, 195A.

[6] *Ibid.* 202C, quae substantia panis et vini apparebat.

[7] *Ibid.* 204A, in excellentioris naturae dignitatem.

[8] *Ibid.* 202A, *cf.* 195A.

[9] *Ibid.* 203C; 204A.

The source of Berengar's eucharistic doctrine was the teaching of John the Scot, and he consistently complained of misrepresentations of John the Scot in his own day.[1] Perhaps, also, Ratramn's book influenced him. Berengar was Scolasticus of Tours by 1031, and Archdeacon of Angers by 1040. His teaching became suspected in a letter written to Lanfranc in 1049, although it appears, from a statement of Adelmann of Liège to have been known a year or two earlier. It was first publicly condemned by Leo IX. at the Synods of Rome and Vercelli (1050). In 1054, at the Synod of Tours, Hildebrand was favourably impressed by Berengar's reasoning, and if Berengar had succeeded in convincing him, the reform of Church doctrine might have been added to the reform of clerical life in the great Hildebrandine programme, and the sixteenth century Reformation might have been obviated. Berengar was the first of the Reformers, although the disappearance of his book in the middle ages has prevented his position in the history of doctrine from being appreciated. In 1059 he was again condemned by Nicholas II. at Rome, and finally by Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) in 1078 and 1079. He died in retirement on the island of Côme near Tours in 1088.

The teaching of Berengar may be gathered from three sources—his early correspondence and that of his adversaries—his *Opusculum*, quoted in the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, written by Lanfranc 1066–1068/1069; his reply to

---

[1] For a full account of Berengar and his teachings, *cf. Berengar ;* on John the Scot, *cf.* pp. 231 ff.

Lanfranc, the *De Sacra Cœna*, 1068–9/1070. The existence of the *De Sacra Cœna* was not known until Lessing discovered it at Wolfenbuttel in Brunswick in 1770. It was published by the Vischers in 1834.[1] As this work contains a complete statement of Berengar's teaching, no quotations from his earlier writings will be given here,[2] nor is there space to discuss the dialectical and philosophical points raised between Berengar on the one side and Lanfranc and Humbert on the other.[3]

Scripture is to be interpreted by the aid of reason.[4] This was Berengar's fundamental principle of interpretation. To explain literally the Johannine statement "Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood ye have no life in you," is to incur the condemnation uttered against "the letter that killeth."[5] Mere quotation of Scripture without resort to reason is not justified, and even Augustine says that authority or the appeal to tradition is not to supersede the appeal to reason.[6] He who declines the use of reason declines an honour conferred on him by God.[7] By reason, in these passages Berengar means little more than common sense or intelligence. He was not a rationalist in the modern sense.

Berengar begins his criticism of Lanfranc and Humbert with a refutation of their denial that the substance of bread and wine remain in the Sacrament after consecration. He seizes the admission of his adversaries that the perceptible qualities, such as colour and smell, remained, and concludes that the substance also must remain, because the qualities cannot be separated from their substantial content.[8] In addition to the evidence of our senses,[9] the words of institution "This is my body," lay stress on a "thing," that is to say on the material bread.[10] Whatever the effect of consecration may be, it does not destroy the natural substance of the bread and wine, a statement which recurs throughout the book.[11]

---

[1] A new edition of this book is required, both on account of the scarcity of the copies and on account of its faulty editing.

[2] For these *cf. Berengar*, pp. 253 ff., 285 ff.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 291 ff., 305 ff. Humbert secured his condemnation at Rome in 1059.

[4] *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 182, 190.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 270 f.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 100.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 101.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 171, 227.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 135, 171.

[10] *Ibid.* p.85; *cf.* p. 234.

[11] *Ibid.* pp. 68 f., 70, 81, 116, 122 f., 129, 143, 146, 161 ff., 170, 186, 191, 194, 209, 212, 230.

Equally vigorously does he refer to the positive statement of Lanfranc's realism that the body of Christ is actually on the altar,[1] and that it is identical with the historical body, born of the Virgin Mary,[2] and he contends that his opponents taught, as a corollary upon this idea, that the sacramental body of Christ comes down from heaven,[3] and is present on the altar in the form of a little portion (*portiuncula*) of flesh[4] and blood.[5] If the sacramental body can be touched and broken it cannot at the same time be invisible and spiritual, or noumenal (*intelligibilis*).[6] He then points out certain other contradictions in the realist position. If the body of Christ is actually present on the altar, then a million bodies of Christ must be daily on the altar, yet if the whole body of Christ were on the altar,[7] only one priest of all who celebrate could offer the sacrifice.[8] Again, Christ's body cannot be cut up into sections,[9] and on the realist theory, it could not be in existence at all until after consecration.[10] The effect of their attempt to perceive a real substantial content in the symbolical terms body and blood is to do away with sacramental teaching.[11] Gore concludes that "his logic is pitiless, morally justifiable and successful."[12]

Did Berengar in spite of this criticism teach the doctrine of the real presence, as some writers have alleged?[13] He says that the body of Christ cannot be brought down from heaven until the end of this dispensation.[14] Since the Resurrection it is indeed visible and palpable,[15] although it cannot be extended in space, nor can it undergo dissolution.[16] Consequently we can only refer to a sacramental breaking of the body of Christ, which itself remains in heaven,[17] as a super-substantial body.[18] It cannot then begin to be at consecration,[19] nor is it visibly and really present.[20] The term "body of the Lord" cannot be applied to the Eucharist save in the sacramental sense used by S. Paul and Augustine.[1] There can be no identification between a sacramental body and the historical body born of the Virgin.[2]

---

[1] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 182; *cf.* pp. 45, 85 f., 197, 200.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 281.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 117.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 45, 109, 119, 127, 140, 168, 189, 194, 197, 203, 242.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 119, 134, 174 f., 203; *cf.* 140 ff., 161

[6] *Ibid.* p. 200 f.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 198.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 199.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 131, 149, 237, 244.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 203.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 81.

[12] *Dissertations*, p. 254.

[13] Schnitzer, pp. 303 ff.

[14] *D.s.c.*, pp. 148, 156 ff., 196 ff.

[15] *Ibid.* pp. 195, 200, 247.

[16] *Ibid.* pp. 94 f., 148 f., 200 f.

[17] *Ibid.* p. 273.

[18] *Ibid.* p. 119 f.

[19] *Ibid.* pp. 94 ff., 148 ff., etc.

[20] *Ibid.* pp. 138, 157, 190, 194, 196, 204, 224, 247, 276, 289.

Berengar's theory of the Sacrament and of the sacramental process or effect of consecration springs from the conception influenced by Platonism, of the contrast between the body of Christ existing in a perfect state in heaven,[3] and its sacramental counterpart or type. The heavenly body of Christ is made available for men, after the consecration of the elements, which, when worthily received, have the value of the body of Christ, and effect the salvation of the soul.[4] After consecration another designation is given to the elements, one which is not derived from their nature—they are now called the body and blood of Christ, although still in substance bread and wine.[5] The consecrated elements constitute the Sacrament, and the heavenly body of Christ, which, according to his argument, is not present, is the "thing" of the Sacrament (*res sacramenti*). If the terms body and blood are applied to the consecrated elements it is only in a figurative (*tropica*) sense, a usage which has the authority of scripture.[6]

The consecrated elements are therefore symbolical of the body of Christ in heaven, they are a figure (*figura*) similitude (*similitudo*) sign (*signum*), pledge (*pignus*) of the Lord's body.[7] Lanfranc reversed the symbolism of the Sacrament by regarding the consecrated elements as symbols of the bread and wine.[8] In the sacramental formula there are two terms, one literal and one figurative, the bread is a literal (*propria locutione*), the body a figurative (*tropica*) term.[9] But Berengar's symbolism was not merely representative or memorialist or sacramentarian. If the consecrated elements symbolise the body of Christ, they mediate to the recipient the effective virtue of the body of Christ, a virtue or grace which is apprehended by the soul as Augustine taught.[10]

---

[1] *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 89; *cf.* 113. [2] *Ibid.* p. 83–87, 91, 127 ff.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 284. [4] *Ibid.* p. 84, valeret ad animae salutem; *cf.* pp. 285, 286, salutaris capiamus effectum. On Berengar's Platonism, *cf.* Geiselmann, p. 364; Ébersolt, p. 172 f.

[5] *D.s.c.* p. 67; *cf.* 231, etc. [6] *Ibid.* p. 86. [7] *Ibid.* pp. 37, 43, etc.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 77, 83, *cf.* 244. [9] *Ibid.* p. 86.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 114, invisibilis gratia; 245 virtus sacramenti; 285 mente reficiamur; 274, 287. *Cf.* John the Scot (Migne, 122, 311B).

Consecration is not followed by the destruction (*corruptio*) of the substance of the bread and wine, and by the creation (*generatio*) of the body and blood.[1] It does not cause the loss of the material or proper nature of the elements.[2] His criticism of metabolism is derived from the Aristotelian conception of matter, although without using "form" in the Aristotelian sense as belonging to the category of substance, in contrast with that of matter.[3] He uses "form" in its modern significance as a function of matter, with reference to the perceptible qualities of a thing, and places "substance" in the category of matter, and "form" in that of accidence, with the result that form or accidence cannot be separated from their concomitants substance or matter.[4] Thus in the Sacrament, if the original essence (*pristina essentia*) disappears, the elements cannot continue to exist merely in appearance (*specie*), for a thing cannot exist which is no longer in the substance in which it was originally.[5] Qualities such as colour cannot survive if the substance is destroyed.[6] So, on the contrary, the body of Christ cannot now be clothed with matter or flesh, for "Christ being raised, dieth no more," and "now know ye Christ no more after the flesh."[7] Nor does God create Christ's flesh from the bread in a miraculous way.[8] The divine action is limited to the operation of the heavenly Word in the bread and wine[9] in the Christian Platonist Alexandrian sense. The bread is hallowed at consecration, it does not undergo a simple conversion.[10] If the elements are no longer what nature formed, it is only in the sense that they are now consecrated. He equates "conversio" with "consecratio,"[11] which supplies the elements with the saving and life-giving efficacy of the body and blood of Christ,[12] and if the elements, while remaining what they were, are yet changed into others, as Augustine and Ambrose taught,[13] they are not changed into the body and blood of Christ, but are raised to a higher value.[1] It is thus impossible to interpret in a realist sense his two isolated statements "I say that the bread and wine of the altar after consecration are the body and blood of Christ,"[2] and "The bread and wine through consecration are converted on the altar into the true body and blood of Christ."[3] Nowhere else in the course of his long controversy does he use similar language, and the significance of these passages is clearly explained in the context. Like "convertere," he equates "conficere" with "consecrare." If the body of Christ is said to be prepared (*confici*) it is only in a sacramental sense,[4] preparation or conversion in the sacramental process is limited to the elements.[5] The process of consecration is mystical, quoting Augustine,[6] and the act of communion is a mystical feeding,[7] but the mystery is destroyed by the language of realism which describes consecration as the breaking of the body of Christ by the priest.[8]

---

[1] *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 68f., 90ff., 123f., 129, 132, 212, 230, etc.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 122.

[3] *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 340, 360.

[4] *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 70, 81, 92, 127, 134, 181, 193ff., 201, 221.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 213.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 93, 171, 227.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 95, 98.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 96f.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 230, cœlestem sermonem in pano et vino operari.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 248.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 188.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 134.

[13] *Ibid.* pp. 140ff., 146, 163, 248, etc.

All writers have agreed that no theory of Transubstantiation can be found in Berengar's doctrine, and Luther's approval of his condemnation by Nicholas II. suggests also that no theory of Consubstantiation was taught by him. His interpretation of the "thing of the Sacrament" is Augustinian, and postulates not a body present, but a mystical archetypal reality, whose virtue or grace is made available by the Sacrament. Thus the doctrine of Berengar is not a bare symbolism wrongly attributed to Zwingli, which defined the elements as mere tokens of grace, and the Eucharist as a mere commemoration of Christ's death; it rather resembles the teaching of Calvin, which laid stress on the condition of the recipient. While Christ's body remains in heaven, its influence, in a mystical way, is experienced by the worthy receiver.

Long quotations are made from the writings of Ambrose and Augustine, and although he makes more frequent use of the former, Augustine's teaching supplies the central theme of his sacramental theory. His contemporary Guitmund of Aversa complained that Berengar had been misled by Augustine,[1] and the modern Catholic writer Geiselmann has summarised the different features of Augustine's teaching which appear in Berengar's book.[2] The term most frequently used by Berengar of the Eucharist is the "Lord's Table," he also frequently describes it as the "body of Christ," or the "Sacrament of Religion." The phrase "celebration" or "meal of the Lord's Table," occurs, although the designation "sacrifice of the Church—of Christian people—of Christ—of the altar" is repeatedly used, and more rarely "the Eucharist." The conception of a "Sacrament," or supper"—as in the title of his book—in preference to "sacrifice," is the usual interpretation adopted by him.

---

[1] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 116, in melius provehi; 156, in ulteriora proficiunt.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 51, 136. [3] *Ibid.* p. 57; *cf.* 248.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 89. [5] *Ibid.* p. 188.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 67, certa mistica consecratione.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 283, per misterium, *cf.* 285. [8] *Ibid.* p. 283.

That Berengar's teaching has not exerted a greater influence upon the later history of sacramental doctrine was due primarily to the destruction or loss of his book during the middle ages. It is doubtful whether more than one copy of it ever existed. Stäudlin concluded that the copy discovered by Lessing was Berengar's original MS.[3] Its editors, the Vischers, decided that it was a faulty copy made by a scribe.[4] The MS. is mutilated, and this may have been done by a friendly hand in order to save it from destruction, but even so it indicates that Berengar's writings, which were, of course, proscribed, were being vigorously sought out for destruction by the ecclesiastical authorities. If the Reformers of the sixteenth century had obtained access to Berengar's work, the reformed doctrine of the Eucharist would have received not merely enrichment, but a definite theory, and for lack of a clear principle of interpretation among them the doctrine of the Sacrament became a source of division.

No doubt, also, the recurrent condemnation of Berengar by ecclesiastical tribunals completely discredited his doctrine in the middle ages. Yet it was not without effect. The sharp realism of Radbert's language was gradually refined away; the crude formula submitted to Berengar by Humbert in 1059 was afterwards abandoned by orthodox writers; and when the Catholic doctrine was enunciated at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) its language was more moderate. So, also, in theological disquisition the criticism of Berengar compelled his adversaries to adopt a less crude and more philosophic terminology. This is especially noticeable in the development of the theory of Transubstantiation. Geiselmann has pointed out that Berengar first made use of the Aristotelian conception of substance and accidence, though in a qualified manner,[1] in order to meet the hardening terminology of realism. Lanfranc pursued a similar course, and first stated the doctrine of the change or conversion of essence (*essentia*).[2] The complete formulation of the theory of Transubstantiation appeared for the first time in the work of Guitmund of Aversa, who defined the doctrine philosophically as a change of substance.[3] Guitmund's term "substantialiter," which had been first used by Durand of Troarn,[4] was embodied by Innocent III. in the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council. The term "Transubstantiation" did not enter the official decrees of the Church until the Council of Trent (Session XIII., cap. 4, 11th October, 1551), but it was in use before the middle of the twelfth century, some sixty or seventy years before the Fourth Lateran. The theory, which in germ can be traced to Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrose, was already attracting attention in the middle of the eleventh century, and was taking shape in the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* of Durand of Troarn,[5] although without the clear formulation supplied shortly after by Lanfranc and Guitmund. So long as the *Expositio Canonis Missae* was attributed to Peter Damiani (d. 1072), it was concluded that the word itself had also been coined in that era. But it has recently been shown, after a protracted discussion, that this tractate was written by Innocent III.[6] The word "Transubstantiatio" was first used by Roland Bandinelli, afterwards Pope Alexander III., in his *Sententiae*, written 1140–1150,[7] and the predicate (*transubstantiare*) appeared a little earlier, in the *Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris* of Stephen of Beaugé, Bishop of Antun (1139–40).[1] In the second half of the twelfth century both substantive and verb came into general use in theological writing.[2]

---

[1] *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate* (Hurter, *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta*, xxxviii (1879), p. 118).

[2] P. 362 f.

[3] *Archiv für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte*, ii (1815), 65.

[4] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 22 f.

---

[1] P. 340. [2] *Cf. Berengar*, p. 295 f.

[3] *Berengar*, pp. 341 ff. Guitmund's work appeared before 1078.

[4] Migne, 149, 1386D; 1405A. [5] *Berengar*, p. 277 ff.

[6] J. De Ghellinck, *Mouvement Theologique* (1914), pp. 355 ff.

[7] De Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*), v. 1913, 1290.

After the failure of the work of Berengar, the Augustinian tradition of dynamic symbolism in eucharistic doctrine lost ground, although it appears again in the teaching of Wyclif. Sacramental doctrine passed into the hands of the orthodox systematists of the twelfth century, who prepared the way for its complete formulation by Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. But with the outbreak of the Reformation Augustinianism revived, and the Evangelical current of interpretation came once more into operation, although without the powerful assistance that Berengar's system might have supplied. Possibly in the attempts which are being made to-day to restate ancient and mediaeval eucharistic doctrine the teaching of Berengar may become an instrument in the re-interpretation of Augustinian sacramental teaching. The theory of "value" is akin to Berengar's idea of sacramental efficacy or virtue, and to the Augustinian theory of grace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BATIFFOL, P. "L'Eucharistе," 1920 (*Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, 2nd Série).
BERENGAR. *De Sacra Cœna.* (A. F. & F. Th. Vischer, 1834.)
ÉBERSOLT. "Essai sur Bérengar de Tours et la Controversie sacramentaire au XI siècle" (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, XLVIII, 1903, pp. 1 ff.; 137 ff.).
FELTOE, C.L. *Journal of Theological Studies*, XI, 1910, pp. 575–579.
GEISELMANN, J. *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, 1926 (*Forschungen zur christliche Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. 15).
GORE, C. *The Body of Christ* (1901).
HARNACK, A. *History of Dogma.* Eng. trans., Vol. IV and V (1898).
HAUREAU, B. *Histoire de Philosophie scolastique*, I (1872).
MACDONALD, A. J. *Lanfranc, His Life, Work and Writing* (1926), pp. 41–55. *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (1930). (Contains a full Bibliography.)
MIGNE, T. P. *Patrologiae*, Series Latina.
NÄGLE, A. *Ratramnus und die Hl. Eucharistie*, 1903 (*Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft*, Bd. 5).

---

[1] De Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de Thélogie Catholique*), v. 1913, 1290.

[2] *Ibid.* 1290–1293.

REUTER, H. *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*, I (1875).
RÜCKERT, L. J. *Der Abendmahlestreit des Mittelalters* (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1858, 22 ff.; 321 ff.; 489 ff.).
RULE, M. *Journal of Theological Studies*, XII, 1910–1911, pp. 413–437.
SCHNITZER, J. *Berengar von Tours, sein Leben und seine Werke* (1890).
SCHRÖCKH, J. M. *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*, XX (1794), XXIII (1796).
SRAWLEY, J. H. "Eucharist" (Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, V, 1912, pp. 555–563).
STEITZ, G. E. *Die Abendmahlslehre der griechischen Kirche im ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung* (*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, IX–XIII, 1864–1868, especially XI–XIII).
STONE, DARWELL. *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, I (1910).

IV. THE SCHOOLMEN OF THE LATER MIDDLE AGES.

ABELARD, AQUINAS AND WYCLIF.

T. C. Hammond.

The stream of Evangelical belief flows sluggishly in this period, and is almost absorbed by the accompanying stream of quasi-material sacramental thought. And yet here and there are traces of the original purer concepts that time has brought down even to this late period. Scholasticism presents a foreign appearance to the thought of to-day. Men no longer rely with unshaken confidence on the findings of their own minds. A shattering empiricism has created an amazed reverence for what are called "facts." Facts seem to stand, stern and unrelenting, confronting our fond theories and frequently dissipating our dreams. Speculation has become sectional, partly because of the wide extension of experimental science, determining for the inquirer a fixed segment of the circle of truth, partly because of the related wide expanse of knowledge itself, rendering it well-nigh impossible to compass the whole field. Idealism itself has become critical and, since Descartes' time, weaves its woof of the Idea upon a warp of doubt. Loud voices call for a New Realism and so the unending conflict continues. Yet not without progress. If the easy-going confidence in our own mental processes has disappeared, the easy-going recourse to an alternative crass materialism has gone with it. Ever, it seems, in the words of Bacon, we are invited to essay "a fresh instauration." For, notwithstanding the pleas of pragmatists, man instinctively believes that truth resides somewhere, and that his duty is to search for it.

One grave danger confronts the investigator—and the reader is invited where he discovers it to make the necessary correction—the danger of explaining the language of the period by imparting into it the opinions and mental features of his own day. This introduces confusion and frequently issues in misrepresentation. And so to our task.

A convenient starting-point offers itself in the Berengarian controversy. Amongst the many recantations required of Berengar the most remarkable is that which was drawn up for his signature at the Council held in Rome in 1059. The confession wrung from him on that occasion contained the statement that "the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are after consecration not only a sacrament, but also the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that with the senses (*sensualiter*) not only by way of Sacrament, but in reality, these are held and broken by the hands of the priest and are crushed by the teeth of the faithful."[1] One hundred years afterwards, the terms of the recantation of Berengar are mildly censured by the glossator Gratian, bidding the reader to understand "warily" the words, lest he fall into a greater heresy than that of Berengar. Indeed, the Berengarian controversy set the tone for the writers of the succeeding age. To substitute "substantialiter" for "sensualiter" became their great aim.

It has become the fashion to credit those who developed the dogma of Transubstantiation with the desire to present for public acceptance, a somewhat refined and spiritual view of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is suggested that in saying "substance," somehow or other matter yields as to an "open sesame," and becomes other than it was. The only parallel that occurs to the mind is Mrs. Eddy's discovery that homeopathy was less noxious than allopathy, because in the former matter had become greatly attenuated. Matter in small doses appeared to merge into spirit. Its smallness is an apology for its existence. The whole argument is a misconception of the medieval spirit and a misapplication of the medieval argument. "Substance" is a generic term covering alike the material and the spiritual, but the substance of a body, albeit the Lord's body, is material. It is not in the word, even when related to the spiritual, that unconscious homage is done to the Evangelical interpretation of the Sacrament.

---

[1] Darwell Stone in Hastings' *Dict. of Religion and Ethics*, ii. 523. It might be suggested that "with the senses" is a somewhat harsh and confused rendering of "sensualiter." The translation "sensibly" would seem to be more appropriate. "Carnally" would of course savour a little of begging the question, although it has much justification in classical and medieval usage. Jewel renders the word "sensibly . . . and in very deed." Dr. Macdonald very happily has "perceptibly" (*cf.* his *Berengar*, p. 130).

And yet the matured dogma of Transubstantiation forced men back to a true spiritual conception. Its logic took three hundred years to work itself out, but the working out was nevertheless inevitable. In the first place, theology was wedded to a peculiar philosophy. The revelation of God was forced to mould itself in the phraseology of Aristotle. No doubt it might be urged that this is always the case. In a measure it is. But the stern voice of authority made permanent that which ought to be transient. Thomas Aquinas, in his devotion to the "Philosopher," fixed the language for all time. This inflicted a blow on progress which led a later age, it may be, to undervalue the contribution of Thomas.

The problem set by the unfortunate use of the word "sensualiter," which Dr. Darwell Stone attributes somewhat inconsequently to panic, was to reconcile the reality, in the philosophic sense, of objective existence apart from the mind, with the non-sensible character of bodily manifestation. Thomas Aquinas is the embodiment of authority. It never occurs to him to question the existing voice of the Church. That voice was mediated to him through the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), which for the first time officially defined the change in the elements of bread and wine as a Transubstantiation. How can one "substance" take the place of another and dissimilar "substance" while there is manifest no change to sense? How can "the whole Christ," an expression singularly enough borrowed from Berengar, be compassed within the dimensions of a wafer, or the minutest particle of a wafer? How can the Sacrament be broken and yet the "res sacramenti" therein contained remain unbroken? How can the Body of Christ be present on the altar and yet discover itself to be independent of locality and time? How can the Christ remain seated at God's right hand dimensively, as Aquinas conceived, and yet be present on the altar in a non-dimensional or other-dimensional form? These were the problems that Thomas Aquinas set himself to solve, always with the restraining necessity of positing a real bodily presence. Modern writers describe the questions and answers as "profound." It is not possible to say what Aquinas felt concerning the necessity of answering them. It is only possible to say that he made a gallant effort. The result is a remarkable mental endeavour that attracts and repels. It attracts by its ingenuity and repels by its unnaturalness. Yet it rendered a negative service to the Evangelical cause. In view of the ponderous system erected by Thomas Aquinas it is no longer possible to insist that the controversy lies between a literal and a figurative interpretation of our Lord's words of institution, so persistently misconstrued as words of consecration. The medieval Christian was invited to compress into the simple words "This is my body" a whole philosophy of the universe. And, in addition, the medieval Christian was invited to believe that the simple words constituted a miraculous interference with the whole course of the natural order.

Whatever might be urged against the Humbertan formula of 1059, it gave an intelligible explanation of the "res sacramenti." A body handled by the priest, broken by his hands and crushed by the teeth of the faithful had elements of reality that commended themselves to the ordinary mind. But a body that could not be handled, that had no dimensions, that moved not "per se," but "per accidens," that could not manifest itself and yet was there—this taxed the ordinary imagination beyond its strength, and by the very audacity and strangeness of its phrasing won acceptance from a credulous age. There was bound, however, to be a reaction. When our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Baptism it is admitted that He left unaltered the processes of nature, and the relation of the visible element to the other surrounding material substances. Hence the new theory demanded a violent divorce of the two Sacraments. This distinction went deep. Medieval theology recognised seven Sacraments. Six of these, on the testimony of Aquinas, are perfected in their use. In one and one only the Author of sanctity is Himself present prior to use. Yet again a material sign is an essential of the Sacrament. In Baptism there is a material substance—water. In the Eucharist there is but a simulacrum—non-inherent accidents. There is a subtle distinction also in the effect of our Lord's words of consecration. Baptism sets a material substance apart by the words of consecration, but apart in its native substantiality. The Eucharist alters a material substance and robs it of its essential character while leaving its proper species unsupported and yet existent. The outward sign is a sign of the non-existent. The understanding is bidden to refuse the attestation of sense.

Inevitably, sooner or later, the question was bound to arise: "What is the need of these subtle distinctions?" Once the question is asked, it positively clamours for an answer. And Aquinas supplies the answer. The "res gratiae" alone matters, and the "gratia sacramenti" is independent of all those changes in material substance which his elaborate theory posited. The two parts of a sacrament, sanctioned by immemorial custom, and quoted from Augustine to Aquinas himself, are compelled to give place to a new threefold division, the "signum sacramenti," the "res sacramenti," and the "gratia sacramenti." So the ancient landmarks were altered. The gifted Dominican's rationalisation of a mistaken current of theological thought may be admitted to be the best defence of a material solution of the problem that the ingenuity of man, aided by speculative philosophy, could effect. But it is incapable of bearing the weight put upon it. It breaks down at every point, and invites a return to a truly spiritual and less involved conception. And even in the period in question, before the critical genius of Wyclif had been turned on the formulative system, there are evidences of the survival of the Evangelical concept. The objections imbedded in the *Summa* of Aquinas bear witness to a vitality in the older doctrine which is now so sadly supplanted.

It might be objected that the statements of opponents, even when given argumentative form as the "contra" of the "utrum" proposed for discussion, cannot readily be accepted as evidence of the actual existence of the opinions advanced within the circle of the Christian Church. In reply it must be said that a careful study of Aquinas suggests that he advances in every case, or almost every case, a known or reasonable position, and in many cases important names are cited, as when he rejects the view of Hugh of S. Victor that "Baptism is water sanctified by God's Word for the blotting out of sins." (*Summa*, Q. LXVI., Art. I., Ob. 2). The assertion of the annihilation of the bread and wine is also frequently discussed by contemporaries and the whole problem of local presence had constituted a difficulty for the author of the *Expositio Canonis Missae,* which he left unsolved.

Two important questions are raised by the author of this treatise, formerly ascribed to Damiani.[1] The first concerns local presence, and is left undetermined, "which I wish rather to leave untouched than to define rashly." The second relates to the consumption by a beast or the burning of the sacrament. "Many often ask and but few understand what is here broken, what is devoured by a beast, what is consumed when the Sacrament is burned. The answer is that as the substance is miraculously converted into the Lord's body and the body begins to be in the Sacrament, so after a kind of way there is a miraculous return when that ceases to be there."[2]

Aquinas embodies these in the objection. He determines the first question by distinguishing between that which is coupled accidentally to a being, and that which belongs to its own natural dimensive quantity, an accident of which our Lord's body is not deprived, but which in the Sacrament is not displayed after its proper manner, but after the manner of substance only. The dimensive quality of the bread, however, is there after its own proper manner, but not inherent in Christ's body. It follows that the substance of Christ's body, taking the place of the substance of the bread, occupies accidentally but not inherently the precise dimensions originally inhering in the substance of the bread.

To Augustine's words: "Give a spiritual meaning to what I have said. You are not to eat the body which you see. . . It is a mystery that I put before you: in its spiritual sense it will quicken you; but the flesh profiteth nothing"; and to the further objection taken from the same authority: "The body in which He rose again must be in one place; but His truth is spread abroad everywhere," Aquinas can only answer by asserting: "He means not to exclude the truth of Christ's body, but that it was not to be eaten in this species in which it was seen by them." "Spiritually" must be taken to mean "invisibly and by power of the Spirit." In support he quotes "Let the Spirit draw nigh to the flesh . . . then the flesh profiteth very much." (Q. 75, Art I.) Thomas here scarcely realises the gulf that separates Hippo from Aquino. In this controversy, unlike others which are handled with consummate skill, he finds himself unable to call for any great support until he reaches the condemnation of Berengar. On several occasions this weakness is manifest. When confronted with the objection "Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink of His blood, you shall not have life in you. Therefore just as Baptism is a necessary Sacrament, so is the Eucharist." He replies: "These words of our Lord are to be understood of spiritual, and not of merely sacramental, eating, as Augustine explains."

---

[1] Dated de Ghellinck *c.*1200 (*cf.* Vacant and Mangenot, *Dict. de Théol. Cath.* v. (1913), 1289).

[2] Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of Holy Euchrist* (1909) I, 261. *Cf.* the passages omitted by Stone.

Yet again, when replying to the objection, "Our Lord said (John vi. 53), 'Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you'; but Christ's flesh is eaten and His blood drunk in this Sacrament; therefore, without this Sacrament man cannot have the health of spiritual life." Thomas comments: As Augustine says, explaining John vi. 54, this food and this drink, namely, of this flesh and blood: He would have us understand as the fellowship of His body and members, which is the Church in His predestinated and called and justified and glorified, His living and believing ones. Hence, as he says in his Epistle to Boniface (Pseudo-Beda on 1 Cor. ix. 17): No one should entertain the slightest doubt that then every one of the faithful becomes a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when in Baptism he is made a member of Christ's body: nor is he deprived of his share in that body and chalice even though he depart from this world in the unity of Christ's body before he eats that bread and drinks of that chalice" (Q. 73, Art. 3).

Aquinas seems strangely unconscious of the fact that if the recipient of Baptism really partakes of the body and blood of Christ in the use of that Sacrament and without any change in the substance of the material sign, then much of his elaborate structure need never be built. This aspect of the matter fell to be retorted upon his followers with merciless logic by Cranmer: "I mean not that Christ is spiritually either in the table, or in the bread and wine that be set upon the table; but I mean that he is present in the ministration and receiving of that holy supper according to his own institution, and ordinance; like as in Baptism

Christ and the Holy Ghost be not in the water, or font, but be given in the ministration, or to them that be truly baptised in water."[1]

Another feature calls for examination. There is a striking difference between Aquinas and Trent in the matter of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Aquinas is a pioneer in distinguishing between Sacrifice and Sacrament. But having made this distinction he makes very sparing use of it. Trent, on the contrary, finds it possible and necessary to devote a whole session (XXII.) to the consideration of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Aquinas and his contemporaries content themselves with a few passing references to the central dogma of modern Romanism. The nature of these references indicates the inchoate nature of speculation on this point in the thirteenth century. In reply to the objection, "A host seems to be the same as a sacrifice. Therefore as (the Eucharist) is not properly called a sacrifice, so neither is it properly termed a Host," Aquinas is content to reply: "This Sacrament is called a Sacrifice inasmuch as it represents the Passion of Christ; but it is termed a Host inasmuch as it contains Christ, Who is a Host (*Douay Version*, 'Sacrifice') . . . of sweetness" (Eph. v. 2). At neither end of this answer does Thomas pass beyond the representative character of the eucharistic sacrifice. Nowhere is any parallel to be found to the later language describing the Mass as a "true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice."

When pressed with the objection that the Sacrament should not have been instituted before Christ's Passion, because it is "the memorial of our Lord's Passion," and a commemoration is of things past, he implicitly accepts that interpretation of the words: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," and replies. "This Sacrament was instituted during the Supper, so as in the future to be a memorial of our Lord's Passion as accomplished." Hence He said expressively: "As often as ye shall do these things," speaking of the future (Q. 73, Art. 5).

In the same context a comparison is instituted between the Paschal Lamb and the Eucharist in the following terms: (The Paschal Lamb's) "successor under the New Testament is the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is a remembrance of the Passion now past, just as the other was figurative of the Passion to come." Yet again, referring to the separate consecration of the bread and wine, the reason is assigned: "In this Sacrament, which is the memorial of our Lord's Passion, the bread is received apart as the Sacrament of the body, and the wine as the Sacrament of the blood" (Q. 74, Art. 1).

---

[1] *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (*Works*, i. 148), Parker Society.

Archbishop Ussher draws attention to the fact that the early Irish Church spoke of receiving the sacrifice, and on this phrase builds the argument that the Sacrament and the sacrifice are not distinguished, but that the Sacrament is spoken of as a sacrifice tropically. "For they did not distinguish the sacrifice from the Sacrament, as the Romanists do now-a-days, but used the name of sacrifice indifferently, both of that which was offered unto God, and of that which was *given to* and *received* by the communicant. Therefore we read of 'offering the sacrifice' to God, as in that speech of Gallus to his scholar Magnovaldus, 'My master Columbanus is accustomed to offer unto the Lord the sacrifice of salvation in brazen vessels'; of 'giving the sacrifice to man,' as when it is said in one of the ancient Synods of Ireland that 'a bishop by his testament may bequeath a certain proportion of his goods for a legacy to the priest that giveth him the sacrifice'; and of 'receiving the sacrifice' from the hands of the minister as in that sentence of the Synod attributed unto S. Patrick, 'He who deserveth not to receive the sacrifice in his life, how can it help him after his death?' And in that gloss of Sedulius upon 1 Cor. xi. 33, 'Tarry one for another,' that is, saith he, 'until you do receive the sacrifice.'"[1]

Similarly to that usage, Aquinas finds no difficulty in speaking of the priest "dispensing the sacrifice to the people" (Q. 82, Art. 3). These are not mere random extracts. They embody nearly all the teaching of *The Summa* on this important aspect. In answer to the direct question, "Whether Christ is sacrificed in this Sacrament?" the answer is given, "The celebration of this Sacrament is called a sacrifice for two reasons. First, because, as Augustine says: 'the images of things are called by the names of the things whereof they are the images; as when we look upon a picture or fresco, we say this is Cicero and that is Sallust. But, as was said above, the celebration of this Sacrament is an image representing Christ's Passion, which is His true sacrifice. Accordingly the celebration of this Sacrament is called Christ's sacrifice. . . . Secondly, it is called a sacrifice, in respect of the effect of His Passion; because, to wit, by this sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of our Lord's Passion. . . . Consequently, according to the first reason it is true to say that Christ was sacrificed, even in the figures of the Old Testament. . . . But, according to the second reason, it is proper to this Sacrament for Christ to be sacrificed in its celebration'."

---

[1] "Religion of the Ancient Irish," in *Answer to a Jesuit*, etc. Cambridge, 1835, p. 551.

As the celebration of this Sacrament is an image representing Christ's Passion, so the altar is representative of the Cross itself, upon which Christ was sacrificed in His proper species (Q. 83, Art. 1).

But any remaining doubt as to the pertinence of regarding the objections as embodying lingering relics of earlier conceptions is set at rest not only by the further specific admission that "some have held that the substance of the bread and wine remains in this Sacrament after the consecration," but by the fact that Peter Lombard a century earlier had criticised the formula submitted to Berengar in 1059. He denied that the actual body of Christ is broken by the priest, and torn by the teeth of the faithful. The body of Christ remains in heaven, and only the accidents are broken and consumed.[1] He expressed a doubt whether the sacramental change is substantial.[2] But he submitted to authority and withdrew his query by saying that the substance of the bread disappears[3] in the body and blood of Christ.[4] In the same era Abelard in the *Sic et Non* embodied many of the arguments which appear as objections in Aquinas. For example, the argument, taken from Cyprian, on the fact that the bread denotes ecclesiastical unity: "One bread is made from many grains, and wine from many grapes," is common to both. Abelard admitted: "It is not yet clear that there has been an end of that supreme controversy concerning the Sacrament of the altar, whether the bread which is seen is only a figure of the Lord's body, or is also the reality of the substance itself of the Lord's flesh."[1]

---

[1] Migne, 192, 865 (*Dist.* xii, 5). [2] *Ibid.* 861 (*Dist.* xi. 1).
[3] *Ibid.* 862 (*Dist.* xi. 3). [4] *Ibid.* 862 (*Dist.* xi. 2).

The extent of the quotations under this head in *Sic et Non* indicates very clearly the fluid nature of belief up to the twelfth century, which evidently disturbed the minds of students even after the condemnation of Berengar in the eleventh century. With a profession of modesty, whether real or assumed it is difficult to decide, Abelard declines to mediate between the struggling doctors whose contradictions or seeming contradictions he religiously sets down. But the authorities he cites against the "essential" theory of the presence of Christ's flesh are weighty indeed. To him we turn to find the trenchant saying of Origen, "'Except ye eat the flesh,' . . . The letter kills. As therefore we have said, every man has in himself some food, from which if there is any good to him who consumes it, and he offers good from a good treasure, he offers clean food to his neighbour. Therefore every man when he speaks to his neighbour, whether it profits or hurts him, whether it is clean or unclean to him, his being is effected. If we speak according to this sense it seems worthy of God to publish such laws to men. If in truth, we rest on the letter I would blush to acknowledge such a law to have been given by God."[2] It is in him we find the saying of Hilary: "That body of Christ which is taken from the altar is a figure so long as the bread and wine appear without, but it is truth so long as the body and blood of Christ is taken, and within is believed."[3]

Perhaps a still more remarkable quotation is supplied from Jerome: "Nevertheless the veriest body and blood of Christ is the word of the Scriptures, is the divine teaching. . . . If at any time we hear the message of God, and the flesh and blood of Christ are poured into our ears and we think of something else, into how great danger (do we run)."[1]

---

[1] Migne, 178, 1286B.

[2] *Ibid.* 178, 1529 Df. Nisi manducavertis carnem meam . . ., occidit haec littera. Ut ergo diximus omnis homo in se habet aliquem cibum, ex quo qui sumpserit, si quidem bonus est, et bono thesauro profert bonum, cibum profert proximo suo. Ideo omnis homo cum loquitur proximo, et sive prodest ei ex sermonibus sive nocet, et mundum ei aut immundum efficitur animal. Si secundum hanc intelligentiam dicamus Deum hominibus leges promulgasse, digna videbitur legislatio. Si vero assideamus litterae, erubesco confiteri Deo tali legem dedisse.

[3] *Ibid.* 1519D. Idem corpus Christi, quod sumitur de altari, figura est, dum panis et vinum extra videtur; veritas autem, dum corpus et sanguis Christi sumitur, interius creditur.

Possibly these quotations are not so familiar as the oft-repeated messages of Augustine which are also found in Abelard's *Sic et Non.* They serve to illustrate the fact that even Aquinas had no easy task, and that a man of his wide reading in the earlier Fathers, made clear by the fact that he refers in the *Summa* to more than eighty writers who preceded him in the Christian Church, would be more or less conscious of some of the difficulties that confronted him. There seems reason, therefore, to adopt the view that many at least of the objections embody earlier traditions.

Aquinas was a diligent reader of the ecclesiastical literature of his day. Occasionally the reader comes across traces of the influence of earlier and more scriptural presentations of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is quite a mistake to imagine that there is so marked a degree of consistency in his writings as to preclude the possibility of such incongruities. A remarkable instance of one such line of thought, which impinges severely on his theory of a substantial and literal presence of the body of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine, is found in the reply to the objection which urges "Christ's Passion is commemorated in the Church on the Friday before Easter, and not on Christmas Day. Consequently since this Sacrament is commemorative of our Lord's Passion, it seems unsuitable for this Sacrament to be celebrated thrice on Christmas Day, and to be entirely omitted on Good Friday (*Summa,* Q. 83, Art. 2). Aquinas replies: "The figure ceases on the advent of the reality. But this Sacrament is a figure and a representation of our Lord's Passion, as stated above. And therefore on the day on which our Lord's Passion is recalled as it was really accomplished, this Sacrament is not consecrated."

Had Aquinas pursued this particular argument to its logical conclusion it might have yielded for him a result not widely different from the later Reformed conception. Indeed in one possible interpretation of the language it opens a wide door for the little understood and frequently assailed Zwinglian attitude. A commemoration of our Lord's Passion in word and psalm is here invested with so much "reality" as to supersede the sensible "figure" presented in the Sacrament. And yet, with strange inconsequence, Aquinas hastens to add that, lest the people should be deprived of the presence of Christ, they are supplied with the consecrated Host of the day before. Students may also notice in this connection the very definite rejection of the idea of consecration by intinction contained in the passage. A useful line of inquiry is opened up, by comparing the language here employed with the statements of Waterland on real and nominal sacrifice. Waterland asserts that a declining age confused sacrament and sacrifice and used the latter term for sacrament, meaning thereby "the sign of a sacrifice."[1] There can be little doubt that this passage in Aquinas, by no means isolated as we have seen, gives point to Waterland's criticism.

---

[1] Migne, 178, 152D, tamen verius corpus Christi et sanguis sermo Scriptuarum est, doctrina divina est . . . . Si quando audimus sermonem Dei, et caro Christi, et sanguis ejus auribus nostris effunditur, et nos aliud cogitamus, in quantum periculum (incurrimus)? (*cf.* Jerome *Brev. in Psa.* cxlvii. Migne, 26, 1259A.)

Further, it could be urged with reason that if the Sacrament be a "figure and a representation of our Lord's Passion," and if its object be to convey the benefits of that Passion—"His body—for us," "His blood shed for the remission of sins," then inasmuch as the incident recalled in the Sacrament is as definitely past as the incident recalled on Good Friday, with which comparison is here effected, the feeding upon the body of Christ must be in another realm than in the sphere of concrete material reality, seeing His body is offered to us in a form and under conditions which no longer exist in that realm. The growing tendency, to which he largely contributed, to separate the sacrificial from the sacramental aspect of the sacred ordinance, blinded him to the obvious inferences that ought to have been drawn from his own language. A close study of Aquinas reveals the fact that the declarations of the early Church on the representative character of the eucharistic feast are so strongly imbedded in patristic writings that they cannot be excised without grave violence to the whole structure of theology. Again and again they rear their head in dignified protest against the later view which threatens their life. They are sufficiently strong to riddle the latter with inconsistencies. Aquinas had an absorbent mind. He did not always assimilate what he absorbed. This becomes apparent in his definition of a sacrament which comes properly in place here in relation to the point under discussion. Aquinas submits two different definitions, and while one is largely regulative of his subsequent writing, he avails himself occasionally of an amphibology resident in the other. A sacrament is defined as "a sign of a holy thing so far as it *makes*[1] men holy." This is the less regulative definition which readily lends itself to the support of the "opus operatum" view of sacramental grace. The other definition, which falls into line with what he writes concerning "the figure" and "the reality," speaks of the Sacrament as "signifying Christ's sacrifice whereby we are made holy." It is obvious that the latter definition allows room for the obsignatory view of sacramental grace, and is more consonant with the general definition of Augustine's writings, from whence it is adopted, than the former definition.

---

[1] *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1896), p. 664: "The Latin name 'sacrificium,' through the unskilfulness of declining ages, came to be used as equivalent to the word 'sacramentum': so that when the Church writers of these times called the elements a sacrifice, they really meant no more than a sacrament, that is, sign of a sacrifice."

It seems obvious that if "the Sacrament of the Eucharist . . . is a remembrance of the Passion now past," and the object of the Sacrament is to signify Christ's sacrifice whereby we are made holy, then the relation between the offered body and blood of Christ and the external symbols must be established by the Word of God and be due finally to the activity of the Divine Spirit on the souls of men, and not to a material change in the symbols themselves. The past exists in two forms—in the memory of man and in the permanent effects which it produced. We are linked to the past by recognition of the event and experience of its effects. The Sacrament, by the appointment of God, recalls the Passion and guarantees the blessings associated with it. There is a dim appreciation of this fact also in Aquinas. He is confronted with the problem which has never been solved in Roman circles. If the Eucharist be a sacrifice—and the very sacrifice of Calvary—then it is available for mortal sin. The answer of Aquinas is unconsciously Evangelical. He distinguishes between the potential efficacy of the sacrifice and the actual effect. Two things are necessary in order to secure the benefit of the sacrifice. The intrinsic value of the offering—and the proper devotion of the offerer. Aquinas detects a defect in the latter, and lays down the proposition that "the sacrifice is available according to the offerer"; or to quote yet another passage: "What is reality only (in the Sacrament), namely, the grace bestowed, is in the recipient." So then it is the appropriative element that is all-important. It is the relation between the offering and the soul of the offerer that really determines the effect of the Eucharist. But such a relation is established when the believing soul passes beyond the symbol and gratefully accepts the reality offered to faith.

---

[1] The italics are ours.

> "Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face,
> Here faith can touch and handle things unseen."

Had Aquinas freed himself from the Church definitions (which had ever to him, however, the aspect of absolute authority) and pursued his line of thought concerning the relation between the offering and the offerer, between the figure which ceased and the reality which Good Friday commemorates, he might have been the precursor of Wyclif, and the beginner of the Reformation.

Strange to say, no such criticisms of the system as these emerge in the days of Aquinas. It seems as if pure theology had but little fascination for the men of his age, who much preferred to engage in pure philosophy. The limits of our discussion preclude an enquiry into the philosophy of Aquinas except in the most general way, so far as it lies at the base of his theological expositions. But the great question which agitated the Thomist and Scotist schools seems very remote from modern modes of thinking. That is to say, not the relation between intellect and will which is, of course, of perennial interest; but the minor problem as to whether the accidents of bread and wine other than dimension, inhere in dimension as a provided substrate or are all equally independent. "Dimension" gave Aquinas great trouble. Round this word cluster those sayings as to the body of Christ not being present as in a place which are eagerly hailed as evidence that Aquinas held a "spiritual" theory of the presence of our Lord's body and blood. It is necessary to examine his theory in order to appreciate the later standpoint of Wyclif. According to Aquinas every material substance comes into being by the will of God. We exclude all discussion on Traducianism and Creationism as not pertinent to the matter in hand. Each substance derives its character from a "form" impressed upon the original indefinite "materia prima." Matter and form, in a combination due to the Divine will, constitute "substance." Each "substance" gathers to itself or supports a number of "accidents." These "accidents" constitute the external manifestation of substance. Through them it affects the senses, and through the senses the understanding. But the understanding is capable of analysis. It perceives, for example, that "whiteness" belongs to different substances. Snow is white and chalk is white. Consequently, "whiteness" is an accident inhering in different substances that conceivably can be separated from them, leaving the essence untouched. Chalk can be blackened by fire, and still be chalk. Yet it would be a mistake to imagine that, therefore, in nature, all accidents are altogether adventitious. On the contrary, all known substances are various modifications of the four elements, earth, air, fire, water, and all draw to themselves appropriate accidents which properly display their characteristics. Substances and their accidents are connected by an invariable law of God. Their divorce is miraculous. The change of accidents observable in ordinary nature is due to the capacity of any created being to receive additional forms, with the exception of the celestial bodies. The forms of these are co-extensive with their entire being. One accident is inseparably associated with all sensible beings—the accident of "dimension." The first determination that can be made concerning any thing, according to Plato, is "great" or "little." Therefore, "dimension" is, as it were, a more intimate accident of material substance, one that is discoverable in relation to every "form" imposed on primitive matter. But although so intimate, it is not in itself "substance." "Dimension," though always in evidence, varies. A little gooseberry has as much the substance of a gooseberry as a big gooseberry. Hence the mode of substance *qua* substance, though never in fact separated from *some* dimension, is in itself something different from the dimension which it supports.[1]

It passes comprehension how anyone can find anything profoundly "spiritual" in this interesting but somewhat elementary analysis of being. Perhaps it is that Wyclif has proved that everybody must be in a place, and the readers of Aquinas think he is solving a riddle like "When is a body not a body." All non-philosophical minds, and some avowedly philosophical minds, at present, are Cartesians, and hold that "the essence of body is extension." Aquinas did not hold it. When the miraculous divorce between "substance" and "accidents," postulated in the Eucharist, takes place, the eye still sees the whiteness of the bread and the redness of the wine extending a certain distance. Are the senses deceived? Aquinas replies in the negative. Previously these qualities were supported by the substance of the bread and wine that in the particular "quiddity" of individual being had a definite dimension. Now the substance being removed the independent accidents are, *as it were* (Aquinas here hesitates for a moment) supported by the dimensional accident which to some extent supplies the place of the missing substance. Boundaries thus become fixed by the accident of dimension which belongs to the bread and not to the body of Christ. The body of Christ does not display its proper dimensions, although the dimensions are there by way of substance. The body is not an indistinguishable mass, but a true body. The eyes, ears, hands and feet of the Son of God are all present in proper relation, but not in dimensional extent, the dimensional "accident" is miraculously suspended. Even the understanding fails to grasp this (as indeed it well might!) but it is clear to faith. No glorified angelic eye can see the body of Christ under its covering of foreign accidents, but the eye of the Son of God sees Himself there because

---

[1] In *Contra Gentiles* I. c. 21. Aquinas distinguishes between such abstract terms as "whiteness" (*albedo*) and "concrete being." The former are "forms which are not predicted concerning subsisting things, whether considered as universals or singulars. These are forms which do not subsist *per se* singularly in the individuals themselves. It is not said that Socrates or man or animal is 'whiteness,' because whiteness does not subsist singularly *per se*, but is individualised through the subsisting subject." Similarly it may be stated concerning concrete being that "natural forms do not subsist singularly *per se*, but are individualised in their appropriate matter."

His eye is there. Nor does the body of Christ take on the dimensional "accident" evident to sense—for this is the "accident" proper to bread—but it exists concomitantly with it, under it, in such a sense that, where this dimensional accident discovers itself, there is also the presence of Christ's body and, sacramentally, not outside it. Were the body of Christ to be present "as in a place," then its proper dimensional "accident" would be in evidence, and it could no longer be compassed within the limits of the particle of bread, nor could it be said to be "as a whole Christ" in every particle. The Scotists rejected the quasi-substantial character here given to "dimension," and insisted that all the accidents were maintained in independence one of another by the power of God. They would explain the appearance to sense by postulating that the removal of the underlying substance of bread or, to speak more correctly, the change of substance which did not; as in nature, affect the accidents, left unimpaired the relation of the accidents to the substance and to one another, hence the old relation of whiteness to extension persisted and was apparent to sense. Analysis of mental processes, for that is all that the discussion affords, proved more attractive than a patient exegesis of Scripture. Surely they had need to take heed of the Saviour's warning, "Wherefore in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

One hundred years after the publication of Aquinas' *Summa*, John Wyclif found himself disturbed by the irregularities of the lives of the clergy, and the scandals of the Great Schism, when three claimants to the Papal Chair were mutually anathematising one another. Like Luther, later, his original revolt against licentiousness and abuses led him to a re-examination of the doctrinal position. Quite openly he took his stand beside the condemned Berengar, protesting against the profession forced from the latter. "It had been of old time the faith of the Roman Church in the profession of Berengar that bread and wine which remain after the blessing are consecrated hosts."[1]

In seeking to place Wyclif in this important controversy, it is best to compare his published utterances with those of his opponents. The best method of accomplishing this is to study the collection of tracts under the suggestive title *Bundles of Tares*, formerly attributed to Walden, but now believed to be the work of several opponents of Wyclif. When the quotations coincide with undoubted passages from *De Blasphemia* and *De Eucharistia* there is evidence that the writer had first-hand acquaintance with Wyclif's views, and so we get the impression of contemporary adversaries, a much more valuable commentary than modern expositions which reflect the colour of later discussion.

---

[1] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 105. Olim fuit fides ecclesiae Romanae in professione Berengarii, quod panis et vinum, quae remanent post benedictionem, sunt hostia consecreta.

Wyclif is remarkable because, himself a Realist,[1] like Aquinas, he assails the main position of Aquinas directly. No longer is there an interminable discussion as to whether dimensive quantity can attach to itself inherently other "accidents." Wyclif assails the whole theory of the division of substance and accidents, and bends his full energies to establish its untenableness. Modern commentators sometimes display a curious reluctance to quote Wyclif directly. The reader is referred to his works which, notwithstanding the excellent labours of the Wyclif Society, are only accessible to students. The consequence is that most of the readers take the verdict of their immediate authorities without any further research, and thus from age to age commonplaces concerning Wyclif are repeated as indubitable that are frequently open to question. Prof. G. M. Trevelyan, in his valuable *England in the age of Wyclif*, contents himself with the assertion that "Wyclif never got beyond Consubstantiation," and Dr. Workman thinks that he retained Transubstantiation.[2] But "Consubstantiation" has been discussed many times, and there is by no means an established consensus of opinion as to what it really means or even as to whether Luther ever held it. Names are the bane of the theological student. History is not a botanical garden with all its flower-beds neatly arranged and classified. The *Bundle of Tares* refuses to confine itself to its assigned patch. It is most annoying to the botanist, but it is a lamentable fact. Wyclif's so-called *Tares* crop up in unexpected quarters when they ought to grow only in Luther's garden. However, Prof. Trevelyan's interests lay in another

[1] In the philosophical sense.

[2] *John Wyclif*, ii. 35 f.

direction, and in his latest edition he cheerfully surrenders the discussion of details to other hands. It ought to be otherwise with avowed theological treatises. It is not always so. We find, for example, the following statement in the article "Eucharist" in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*—"Wyclif himself, while holding that the disposition of the priest affected to some extent the value of the Mass celebrated by him, regarded the sanctity which the Sacrament has from Christ's presence as the same in all Eucharists."[1]

Some of Wyclif's language looks like an assertion of a merely symbolical presence. He rejects Transubstantiation, identification, impanation, and maintains that the words of institution are used in a tropical sense (C. 9, p. 291). He attacks the popular idea of a sensible visible presence of Christ (C. I., p. 20 f.) and maintains that the body of Christ is "virtually in the Host as in a sign" (C. 8, p. 271). The Sacrament is the form of bread and wine, and not Christ or part of Him (C. I., p. 29). But this language was directed against the materialistic conception of the time. Wyclif's positive teaching seems to indicate a belief in a real, though sacramental, virtual, spiritual presence (*op. cit.* C. I., p. 15, *cf.* C. 4., p. 84 f., *F.Z.* 115, 117). Similarly, Workman in the article "Wyclif," in the same encyclopaedia, assures his readers that because Wyclif was a Realist, he employed "figura" in a Realist sense. It was not an empty image, but directly referred to the reality of which it was an image. Then he quotes Wyclif's own words that the Sacrament is "simul veritas et figura." As a general criticism of all such presentations, it may be urged that they appear to manifest a greater anxiety to absolve Wyclif from certain errors, real or imaginary, than to exhibit the peculiar characteristics of his teaching. There is no discrimination between his own direct contributions and the elements he incorporated from other systems. It has been shown, for example, that the view that the Mass has a value in proportion to the disposition of the offerer is developed in Aquinas, while the words "simul veritas et figura" belong properly to Augustine.[2]

---

[1] Quoting *De Eucharistia*, C.4 (Loserth).

[2] *Sic et Non*, Migne, 178, 1530B.f. Utrum sub figura an sub veritate sit mystici calicis sacramentum. Veritas ait: *Caro Mea vere est cibus*, etc. Alioquin quomodo magnum erit *panis quem dabo* . . . nisi vera sit

It is not easy to understand what is meant by saying that as Wyclif was a Realist a different connotation must be given to the Latin word "figura." The Realists did not, any more than the Nominalists, make havoc of the Latin language. Like all philosophers, they imported certain technical significances into their words, but they did not break up the procrustean bed of convention. Tertullian, Aquinas and Wyclif, men separated from one another in mental mode and general outlook, are assumed to have conspired to make "figura" other than it seems. There is no hint of this sinister intention conveyed in their writings. Aquinas freely contrasts "figura" with "realitas," and as freely makes it synonymous with "representatio." There is nothing in Realism as a philosophy calculated to disturb the time-honoured relation between a picture and its prototype. Aquinas modifies the philosophy of Augustine. He finds no difficulty in taking over in their plain sense the terms "figura," "mysterium," "mystice," that occur so frequently in the discussion of this subject, in Augustine's writings. It is not thus that light can be thrown on the controversy that agitated the fourteenth century. Every writer is like the scribe instructed in the kingdom who brings out of his treasure things new and old. In order to gather the full significance of an author's position it seems wisest to place him in relation to his immediate contemporaries. It is thus that the new feature, if any, most readily comes to light. A careful examination of *Fasiculi Zizaniorum*, already mentioned, seems the best way of accomplishing this in the case of Wyclif.

It seems most important to observe that Wyclif assailed the whole theory of Transubstantiation. Whatever might or might not be true concerning the relation of the Sacrament to the body and blood of Christ, this particular solution must be incontinently rejected. The Sacrament of the

caro? Sed, quia Christum vorari dentibus fas non est, voluit hunc panem et vinum in mysterio vere carnem suam et sanguinem consecratione Spiritus sancti potentialiter creari et quotidie pro mundi mystice immolari, ut sicut de Virgine per spiritum vera caro sine coitu creatur, ita per eumdem ex substantia panis et vini mystice idem corpus Christi consecretur. Corpus Christi et veritas et figura est. (That Wyclif borrowed this passage from Augustine, through Abelard or directly, is proved by the fact that he also institutes the parallel with the Incarnation in practically identical terms.)

Eucharist is in its own nature bread and wine. The opinion concerning Transubstantiation ought to be allowed to fade from the minds of the faithful.[1] These are the declarations which he is charged with setting forth publicly, and they fittingly form a starting-point into the inquiry as to his real views.

Wyclif, like his contemporaries, had a philosophical interest in religious questions. To that extent he was a true Schoolman. When it is said that his so-called negative position is directed against "the materialistic conceptions of his age," the position may be accepted only on the assumption, which is perfectly correct, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation propounded by Aquinas is itself materialistic. It is against that theory, of which he indubitably possessed accurate and first-hand knowledge, that he levels his deadliest shafts. Wyclif adopted the Realist philosophy, but no doubt he was influenced by the Conceptualism of Abelard. He could accept and harmonise the two dicta, "Universalia ante rem," and "Universalia in re." But "the thing" which was an exemplar and species of the universal was "the thing" in its completed being of substance and accidents. This is fundamental for his theory. He holds that the relation of subject or substance to its accidents is so fundamental that the separation of the two involves the destruction of the faith and renders possible the annihilation of God.[2] In his defence, issued after the condemnation of the Council of London, which he sarcastically describes as "concilia terraemotus," Wyclif alleges that his opponents are not able to define the "quidditas" of the non-inherent accidents beyond declaring that they "constitute the very consecrated Host itself." It seems strange that this direct, pertinent, contemporaneous controversy is so skilfully veiled in many descriptive treatises illustrating Wyclif's work. A "quiddity" for the Schoolmen of the Thomist and Scotist circles unquestionably meant the individualised thing which, to the Nominalist was itself the ultimate reality, and to the Realist or Conceptualist partook of the nature of the universal. Different locations in space distinguished "quiddities" of the same species one from another.[1] Wyclif acutely observes that beyond the bare assertion that there are "accidents," his opponents are at a loss in giving a close definition of their "host." It is a sign, otherwise it would not have a sacramental character, but as a sign it is itself an airy nothing, a collection of sensible qualities that qualify nothing. "They lay down," he said, "concerning the brethren that it is enough on this head to say that the consecrated hosts may be accidents without underlying substance or nothing. And this they published, but silently, in their "earth-moving" general council of London. Indeed, there they established publicly, that there may be in the Sacrament of the altar accidents without a subject; these accidents they are not able to feign save as the consecrated host itself. Otherwise indeed, they know not what is the essential characteristic (*quidditatem*) of these hosts, nor can they feign by what power of their benediction accidents thus marvellously (*miraculose*) may be without a subject, unless the very accidents shall be the sensible Sacrament itself, when they feign that this thing may not be to faith itself[2] 'bread or the body of Christ,' nor yet have any substance in which they naturally subsist."[3]

---

[1] "Conclusions" (*F.Z.*, p. 106.) Sacramentum eucharistiæ est in natura sua corpus panis aut vini; habens virtute verborum sacramentalium, verum corpus Christi ad quemlibet ejus punctum.

Sacramentum eucharistiae est in figura corpus Christi et sanguis, in quae transubstantiatur panis aut vinum, cujus remanet post consecrationem aliquitas, licet in consideratione fidelium sit sopita.

[2] "Conclusions," *F.Z.*, p. 106. Quod accidens sit sine subjecto, non est fundabile; sed si sic, Deus annihilatur, et perit quilibet articulus fidei Christianae.

---

[1] "Quiddity" is identified with "essence." Generally "essentia" in Aquinas refers to concrete beings. The "quiddity" of a corporal existent being is its nature, that which causes it to be what it is, and which, if removed would alter its whole character. But such essence or "quiddity" is discoverable in nature only in singular exemplars. In thought there can be a "quiddity" without a thing. In fact a "thing" has its own peculiar "quiddity," never separated from its nature. "Also the essences or quiddities of genera and species are individualised according to the definite matter of this or that individual, although the generic or specific quiddity includes form and matter in general, hence it is not said that Socrates or man is humanity"; and previously in the same chapter (*Con. Gen.* I. c. 21) he says, "Also natural forms do not themselves subsist as singulars but they are individualised in their appropriate matter, whence we do not say this or that fire, but fire is its proper form."

[2] Better, "as of faith itself that it cannot be."

[3] "Defence," *F.Z.*, p. 285: "Ponunt," inquit de fratribus, "ut ad partem satis didici, quod ipsa consecrata hostia sit accidens sine subjecta substantia, sive nihil. Et hoc publicarunt, sed tacite, Lundoniis in generali eorum concilio terraemotus. Posuerunt enim ibi publice, quod in sacramento altaris sit accidens sine subjecto, quod accidens non possunt

A close examination of this defence helps materially towards a true understanding of Wyclif's position. There must be a substance in the Sacrament, otherwise the whole fabric of theology and even the being of God Himself is imperilled. There cannot be a substance without its adequate accidental manifestation. The persistence of the accidents of bread is sufficient to establish the existence of bread, and the same is true regarding the wine. To suggest that there is a Sacrament which is not a quiddity in the philosophical sense of that term is to leave the authors of this conceit in a hopeless muddle. The "host" is not bread, and is not "accidentally" the body. What is it? Just the host. That is all that can be said of the visible existent thing which has been consecrated. And all this Wyclif, with a curl of the lip, declares is in some unaccountable way the "consequences of their benediction."

Keeping strictly to this line of argument, it is apparent that Wyclif is fixed to the statement which he unconditionally makes: "The consecrated host which we see on the altar is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but an effectual sign."[1] It is impossible, in his view, for a body to be present unless it is present in the fulness of its attributes, having dimension, colour, smell, taste, etc., appropriate to the substance of which it is formed. This being conceded, a consecrated host so long as it maintains the appearance of bread, cannot be anything else than bread, cannot be a part or the whole of the body of Christ.

And yet Wyclif does not hesitate to declare in the same context: "The Eucharist contains by virtue of the sacramental words, as it were the body and blood of Christ, truly and really, at every part of it."[2] This is repeated in the quotation given earlier in connection with the distinct

---

fingere, nisi ipsam hostiam consecratam. Aliter enim nescirent dicere hujus hostia quidditatem, nec fingere quomodo virtute benedictionis suae sit (*or* sic) accidens sic miraculose sine subjecto, nisi ipsum accidens foret ipsum sensibile sacramentum; cum fingunt ut fidem quod ipsum non potest esse panis vel corpus Christi, nec habere aliquam substantiam, quae ipsi naturaliter sit substrata.

[1] "Conclusions," *F.Z.*, p. 105. Hostia consecrata quam videmus in altari, nec est Christus nec aliqua sui pars, sed efficax signum.

[2] *F.Z.*, p. 105. Eucharistia habet, virtute verborum sacramentalium, tam corpus quam sanguinem Christi, vere et realiter, ad quemlibet ejus punctum.

assertion that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is in its own nature the body of bread and wine. It is assertions such as these which have led to the statement that Wyclif held Consubstantiation. But if the word be taken to represent a presence of the substance of Christ's body, together with the bread and wine, this is the very position Wyclif labours to deny. The substance of our Lord's body could not be present without its accidents. Therefore the Lord's body would have to be dimensionally in the consecrated host. It could not be substantially "ad quemlibet ejus punctum," a mode of thought that recalls Guitmund's insistence on the presence of the whole Christ in every part of the consecrated element, a conclusion to which Berengar said the materialist theory of his day was driven.

Yet one further feature must be noted before Wyclif is permitted to give his own explanation of his language, which after all might best determine his attitude. Not only does he contend that the body of Christ is in the Sacrament, but he maintains that it is present "marvellously" or "miraculously" in a manner distinct from other sacraments. But when we inquire what he means by other sacraments, we find that on one occasion he contrasts the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist with the presence of His body on a crucifix. It is quite evident that in this connection he uses "sacramentum" in the wider sense of religious sign. In the context, when explaining the "marvellous presence" in the Eucharist, he speaks of it as "beyond the possibility of signs of human institution." It is fair to suggest that the related Sacrament of Baptism was not present to his mind, and that what he was seeking to establish was the efficacy of the Sacrament which it derived from the fact of its divine appointment.

There cannot be a substantial body in the Eucharist, otherwise Wyclif's whole theory falls to the ground. There must be a marvellous, miraculous, connection between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, otherwise the Sacrament is indistinguishable from any historical or symbolical pageant. It is a figure of the body like the crucifix and nothing more. How does Wyclif solve the problem? We take a lengthy passage from his *Confessions* as a complete answer. It is particularly valuable as it seemed in the judgment of his adversaries to reveal his *Bundle of Tares*:

> "The same body and the same substance is truly and really sacramental bread or consecrated host which the faithful perceive (the word is *sentiunt* = sensible experience) in the hands of the priest. . . . Nevertheless we do not dare to say that the body of Christ is essentially, bodily, or identically that bread. Just as the *extended body*[1] of Christ is that bread; but the body itself is not extensively or dimensionally that bread. We believe indeed that there are three modes of being of the body of Christ in the consecrated hosts—virtual, spiritual and sacramental. That is a virtual mode by which He does good through the whole of His dominions according to the goods of nature or of grace. But the spiritual mode of being is that in which the body of Christ is in the Eucharist and in the saints, through grace. And the third mode of being, the sacramental, is that by which the body of Christ is peculiarly in the consecrated host. . . . And that mode of being, the spiritual, is more truly in the soul. . . . But the mode of being by which the body of Christ is in the consecrated host is a true and real mode, when the Author Who is not able to deceive said: 'This is my body,' and left to His priests a similar power of performing this. But all this we gather from the faith of the Scriptures. Moreover, Christ is more especially in that Sacrament than in others when at once truth and figure may be in that, but is not thus in other sacraments. And thus it is evident that the sacramental mode of being is marvellous. But the worshippers of the signs are unable to establish that their Sacrament is also really the body of Christ."[2]

---

[1] The italics are ours.

[2] Confessio, *F.Z.*, p. 115 ff. idem corpus, et eadem substantia est vere et realiter panis sacramentalis vel hostia consecrata, quam fideles sentiunt in manibus sacerdotis. . . .

Non tamen audeo dicere quod corpus Christi, sit essentialiter, substantialiter, corporaliter, vel identice ille panis. Sicut corpus Christi extensum est ille panis; sed ipsum corpus non est extense vel dimensionaliter ille panis.

Credimus enim quod triplex est modus essendi corporis Christi in hostia consecrata, scilicet virtualis, spiritualis, et sacramentalis. Virtualis est quo bene facit per totum dominium, secundum bona naturae vel gratiae. Modus autem essendi spiritualis est, quo corpus Christi est in eucharistia

> "But besides these three modes of being of the body of Christ there are given three other modes more real and truer which the body of Christ properly has in heaven, that is, the mode of being which is substantial, corporal and dimensional."[1]
>
> "Let us hold, therefore, that, by virtue of the words of Christ, the bread may be made, and is marvellously the body of Christ beyond the possibility of signs of human institution. . . . What thus we ought to understand is that spiritually we eat the flesh of Christ on the altar. And that is a true mode of body though it cannot be a mode according to body in the property of body because John vi. 63, Christ says 'The flesh profiteth nothing.'"[2]

These quotations form one of the most remarkable contributions to theological thought. It spans the centuries. In the phrase "simul veritas et figura" it recalls Augustine. In the phrase "et iste modus essendi spiritualis est verior in anima" it anticipates Hooker. Three features invite attention. The body of Christ is present "virtualiter." Wyclif in discussion gave an illuminating illustration of his meaning here: "Then when preaching Master John Wyclif argued concerning the conclusions he set forth and was impeached by various religious doctors of sacred theology. Then the same Master repeated amongst other things three opinions concerning the multiplication of body, that is to say,

---

et sanctis per gratiam. Et tertius modus essendi sacramentalis, quo corpus Christi est singulariter in hostia consecrata . . . Et iste modus essendi spiritualis est verior in anima. . . .

Modus autem essendi quo corpus Christi est in hostia consecrata est modus verus et realis, cum auctor qui mentiri non potest dixit *Hoc est corpus meum*, et reliquit suis sacerdotibus virtutem similiter faciendi. Hoc autem totum ex fide Scripturae colligitur. Ideo Christus est specialiori modo in isto sacramento, quam in aliis, cum sit simul veritas et figura in isto; non est autem sic in aliis sacramentis: et sic patet iste miraculosus modus essendi sacramentalis. Cultores autem signumorum nescunt fundare quod suum sacramentum sit tam realiter corpus Christi.

[1] *Ibid.* 117. Sed praeter istos tres modos essendi corporis Christi, est dare tres alios modos realiores et veriores, quos corpus Christi appropriate habet in coelo; scilicet modus essendi substantialiter corporaliter, et dimensionaliter.

[2] "Confessio," *F.Z.*, pp. 120 and 124. Teneamus ergo quod, virtute verborum Christi, panis fit, et est miraculosus corpus Christi, ultra possibilitatem, signi humanitus instituti. . . . Quod oportet sic intelligi, quod spiritualiter sumimus Christi carnem in altari. Et ille est verus modus corporis, licet non sit modus consequens corpus, in quantum corpus: quia John vi. 63 dicit Christus "Caro non prodest quicquam."

dimensional, definitive, and virtual. The first two he declared were altogether false and impossible, but he acknowledged the third. Whence he declared that the body of Christ is not in the Sacrament of the altar after the manner of multiplication, but that it is there virtually to this extent as the king is in the whole kingdom."[1]

It seems impossible with this illuminating example of the king's influence in regions where he is corporally and dimensionally absent to miss the precise meaning of "virtualiter." Wyclif held that the inherent power of the body of Christ was in the Sacrament, a position largely developed in English theology by Jeremy Taylor. In the *Confession* which has been quoted at length, Wyclif avows himself prepared even to accept the view of Hugo of S. Victor, that the body of Christ is present corporally (*corporaliter*), provided he is allowed to interpret it as meaning "according to the power of the body and blood of Christ" (*secundum corporis et sanguinis Christi virtutem*). The argument recalls the passage in Calvin's *Institutes*, where he speaks of the power of the sun operative on earth, though the orb itself is dimensionally and corporally removed by many thousands of miles. Nor is there much difficulty in understanding what is further said concerning the spiritual eating of Christ's flesh. This must be governed by Wyclif's own statement that the experience is more truly in the soul, and by his further elaboration in the *Confession* which regards the spiritual as regulative alike of the virtual and sacramental experience. The body present through grace is a very beautiful expression which carries us beyond the visible elements, and suggests to us the direct dealing in mercy, by the Gracious Author, with our individual souls. Happy had it been for the world and the Church had this aspect been urged to the exclusion of tedious controversies concerning the precise literal form of conjunction between the believing soul and that body of the Lord which was given for him. Wyclif was a son of his age, and could not wholly free himself from the thought-moulds of his age. But here he bursts forth into that clearer atmosphere in which all values are placed in proper perspective through the light that streams from the very throne of God. He not only anticipates the words of Hooker, but more surely anticipates the awe-inspiring thoughts of the great English divine: "The power of the Ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory, it raiseth men from the earth and bringeth God Himself down from heaven; by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible grace, it giveth daily the Holy Ghost, it hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and that blood which was poured out to redeem souls. When it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked they perish, when it revoketh the same they revive."[1] Perhaps it may be permitted to add the direct message of Hooker concerning this spiritual apprehension of the Sacrament. "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.[2] . . . What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ.[3] . . . Our participation of Christ in this Sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipotent power which maketh it His body and blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the element such as they imagine we need not greatly to care nor inquire."[4]

---

[1] *F.Z.*, p. 107. Unde cum praedictus magister Johannus Wycliff argueretur de praedictis conclusionibus, et impugnaretur per varios sacrae theologicæ doctores religiosos. Tum idem Magister recitavit inter altera cetera tres opiniones de multiplicatione corporis, videlicet, dimensionalem, deffinitivam, et virtualem. Primas duas asseruit omnino esse falsas et impossibiles, et tertiam concessit. Unde asseruit quod corpus Christi non est in sacramento altaris per modum multiplicationis, sed quod est ibi virtualiter tantum, sicut rex est in toto regno.

The last feature, which is the one to which the words "marvellous" or "miraculous" and peculiar" are applied, is the description of the sacramental mode of the presence of the body and blood of Christ. It is worth noticing that Wyclif, like Hooker, avoids the ambiguous phrase "real presence." He prefers, like the great English theologian, to address himself directly to the question of the presence of the body and blood of Christ. Much labour would have been saved had all writers followed his example.

Wyclif distinctly asserts that the sacramental presence of the body and blood of Christ is a presence in figure. The extended body is the bread, but the body in extension is not in or under the bread. He is anxious to attach full significance to our Lord's words, "This is my body." Inasmuch as his theory compels him to assert that bread in its own nature is present, then bread must be not only bread, but also the body of the Lord. He will have nothing to do with a collection of accidents which is neither bread nor yet the body of Christ. This attitude must regulate all further discussion. But his opponents were quick to urge that bread in its own nature could only be a representation of the body, and sought to draw from that the conclusion that the Sacrament of the Eucharist operated only by way of stirring up the minds by remembrance. It must be borne in mind that neither in Aquinas nor in any contemporary writer had the word "Sacrament" lost its meaning of external sign. In the polemic against the upholders of Transubstantiation, as has been seen, Wyclif makes great use of this admitted connotation of the word. Other signs of human institution have then a symbolical character, and no more. The Rock of the Old Testament foreshadowed Christ, the crucifix represents Him. Mindful of the forced recantation of Berengar, where no alternative is offered between crushing the flesh literally and depicting an absent body in sign only, Wyclif insists that the Sacrament is truth as well as figure. The *power* of Christ is there, and the power of Christ's body effecting a real conjunction, a true communion of the believer and that body, a spiritual but most real incorporation into the body and blood of Christ. Spiritually Christ is there to convey to the soul of the believer not some vague spiritual blessing hazily defined, but the very body and blood offered for the sins of the world. Corporally, essentially, identically, the bread cannot be the body. Virtually, and spiritually, the bread is the body, and that fact isolates the Sacrament from all mere signs. The body is there in a special manner. It is more than a recalling, more than a commemoration. It is a real feeding on the sacrificed Lord. Away with all suggestion of mere symbol and pageant, but away also with the degrading conceptions that make a literal substance essentially present a condition of this "marvellous" or "miraculous" relation of the sign to the thing signified. It is an "effectual sign," but the effect must be sought in the

---

[1] *Eccl. Polity,* V. lxxvii. 1.
[2] *Ibid.* lxvii. 6.
[3] *Ibid.* lxvii. 12.
[4] *Ibid.* lxvii. 6.

Word of God that makes real to the soul that which is outlined in the sensible element.

That such is the final verdict of Wyclif may be gathered from the confessions of his followers and the condemnation of his adversaries. The investigation may fittingly close with typical quotations from both sources. John Badly was one of the first victims of the ecclesiastical tyranny of Wyclif's age. Prof. Trevelyan has preserved his stout rejection of the idea that the living Lord held His own body in His hand at the Last Supper. William Sawtre, the priest, maintained the same position: "And then, having finally been required to say what he thought, he said and declared ultimately that after consecration had been duly made by a priest the same bread remained in the nature it had before."[1]

Sawtre's own words are recorded as follows: "Having been questioned concerning the Sacrament of the altar, I have said that pronouncing of the sacramental words of the body of Christ, the bread which we break remains as the Apostle says in 1 Cor. x. 16, nor does it cease to be simply bread; but it is holy bread, true and living as the Gospel of John says Cap. VI. 51, and this I firmly believe."[2]

The sense in which the opponents of the Lollards understood their declarations can be gathered by the condemnation of their conclusions issued at the instance of Arundel. It must be borne in mind that the Lollards definitely claimed Wyclif as their leader and teacher:

"The fourth conclusion, that the feigned miracle of the bread of the Sacrament leads all men except a few into idolatry, because they think that the body of Christ, which is never outside of heaven, by the power of the words of the priest is included essentially in a little piece of bread which they display to the people; but God willeth what they will to believe, what the evangelical doctor says in his *Trialogus*, that the bread of the altar is constitutionally the body of Christ."[1]

---

[1] *F.Z.*, p. 411. Et tunc requisitus finaliter ad dicendum quid sentiret, dixit et asseruit ultimate quod post consecrationem a presbytero rite factam, remanet idem panis in natura qui ante," etc.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 410. Item interrogatus de sacramento altaris dixi, quod post prolationem verborum sacramentalium corporis Christi, remanet panis quem frangimus, sicut dicit apostolus 1 Cor. x. 16, nec desinit esse panis simpliciter; sed est panis sanctus, verus et vivus, ut dicit Evangelium Johannis Cap. VI. 51; et sic credo firmissime.

The figurative conception which the Lollards held side by side with the spiritual interpretation of the inner sacramental reality is thus faithfully registered in the records of their opponents:

"That as John was figuratively Elias and not personally, so the bread is figuratively the body of Christ, and not naturally the body of Christ, and that to avoid all ambiguity this is a figurative speech: 'This is my body,' even as in that word of Christ John himself is Elias."[2]

To sum up the discussion. Wyclif regarded the by then traditional doctrine of Transubstantiation as philosophically untenable and as scripturally false. Further, he held himself free from all theories of a dual substantiality in the consecrated matter of the Sacrament. There was not bread and the body of Christ both present in their own proper mode of being. Like Hooker, however, he distinguished between this Divine Sacrament and other signs which were signs and nothing more. He placed the difference in the omnipotent word of God which made the bread to be the body of Christ in all the range of that body's vivifying and gracious operations. Not in matter, but in mind, not in physical transmutation, but in spiritual relation, does he discover the true value of the words of Him who cannot lie when He said "This is my body."

---

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia* (1737), iii. 221f. Quarta conclusio, quod fictum miraculum sacramenti panis inducit omnes homines, nisi sunt pauci, in idolatriam; quia ipsi putant quod corpus Christi, quod nunquam est extra caelum, virtute verborum sacerdotis, includeretur essentialiter in parvo pane, quem ipsi ostendunt populo, sed vellet Deus quod ipsi vellent credere, quod doctor evangelicus dicit in suo trialogo, quod panis altaris est habitualiter corpus Christi. (The word "habitualiter" is evidently in contrast with "essentialiter." It must mean therefore "by custom or constitution" as distinct from "by actual change.")

[2] *Ibid.* p. 229. "Quod sicut Johannes fuit figuraliter Helias et non personaliter; sic panis est figuraliter corpus Christi et non naturaliter corpus Christi, et quod absque omni ambiguitate haec est figurative locutio 'Hoc est corpus meum' sicut illa in verbis Christi Johannes ipse est Helias."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

ABELARD. (Migne, 178.)
AQUINAS. *Summa Theologica.* (Eng. Trans. Dominican Fathers, London, 1920.) *Summa contra Gentiles*, Rome, 1894. (Eng. Trans. J. Rickaby.)
ARNOLD. *Select English Works of Wyclif* (1869–71, especially vol. III.).
HAMMOND, T. C. *Transubstantiation* (National Church League, 1928).
HARPER. *The Metaphysics of the School* (1880).
HASTINGS, W. *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, Articles on Abelard, Aquinas and Wyclif.
LECHLER, G. V. *Wycliffe and His Precursors* (1878).
LILLEY, A. L. *Sacraments* (1928).
LITTON, E. A. *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (1912).
LOSERTH, J. *Wiclif and Huss* (1884).
MATTHIAS. *Early Works of Wyclif hitherto unpublished* (1880).
ROYCE, J. "Latin Scholastic Terms." (*Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*.)
WILKINS, D. *Concilia*, III (1737).
WILLET. *Synopsis Papisimi* (Vol. V., 1852) on "Concomitancy," and the "Carnal Presence."
WORKMAN, H. B. *John Wyclif* (1926).
WULF, DE. *History of Mediaeval Philosophy* (Eng. Trans. Messinger 1926).
WYCLIF. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, T. Netter. (W. W. Shirley, Rolls Series, No. 5, 1859.) *De Eucharistia* (J. Loserth, 1892, Wyclif Society). *Trialogus* (G. V. Lechler, 1869, Wyclif Society). Foxe, "Acts and Monuments" (Wilkins' *Concilia*, III.).

V. THE REFORMATION OF DOCTRINE.

CONTINENTAL AND ENGLISH REFORMERS.

HAROLD SMITH.

Two preliminary points first call for clear statement: Firstly, since much in the statements of eucharistic doctrine made by Zwingli and Calvin is in opposition to the view of Luther, as well as to that of Romanism, it is important to give a clear general idea of Luther's view of the Sacrament. He was a scholastically trained theologian, and drew much of his view from later mediæval writers such as D'Ailly.[1] He denied Transubstantiation—the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; but, taking the words of institution literally, declared that in, with, or under the bread and wine are also given the natural body and blood of Christ. Hence the term "Consubstantiation." This is possible because of the ubiquity of Christ's glorified body; it is not locally in one place, heaven, but everywhere. The natural presence becomes a sacramental presence, not by the consecration of the priest, but by virtue of God's promise attached to the Sacrament. This body is received by all, good and evil; but there is no sacramental presence of Christ apart from the eating and drinking, hence no reservation or adoration of the elements. Secondly, the true meaning of the objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist may be quoted in the words of Dr. H. R. Mackintosh[2]:

> "In receiving with faith the symbols of Christ's flesh and blood we receive Christ Himself. The whole is a spiritual transaction between persons, a spiritual conveyance of Christ to the soul of the believer. We feed upon Him spiritually in so intimate and real a fashion that He could describe it as eating His Body. When we partake worthily, we have received through an emblematic action all that Christ's death won for us. . . .

---

[1] D'Ailly was uncertain on Transubstantiation, but accepted the authority of the Church, and was one of the opponents of Hus. (Editor.)

[2] *Expositor*, 1904, pp. 191 ff.

> When the presence of Christ is placed in the elements rather than in the hearts of the receivers . . . the real and objective presence of Christ is confused with His local presence. . . . Some of the best reformed divines are not guiltless of depersonalising the sacramental process, in so far as they lay a false emphasis on the flesh and blood of Christ in contrast with Christ Himself. How much fruitless debate as to whether that which is received is the natural body or the glorified, the humanity of Christ or His divinity, might have been avoided had men clearly kept in mind that what flesh and blood signify is simply the person of our Incarnate Lord. But these writers seem to be haunted at times that it is not enough to know that in the Sacrament the soul feeds upon Christ by faith and love; they must get behind that . . . and grasp some spiritual and heavenly *substance* by assimilating which celestial benefits become ours. Notions of this kind are to be found even in Calvin. . . . In the higher realms of his theory he put forward certain speculations which have little real meaning. . . . No doubt in emphasising in what seems an unfortunate manner the presence of Christ's actual flesh and blood in the Sacrament, Calvin was strongly influenced by custom, by the exigencies of his polemic, and by a natural desire to preserve the very words of Scripture. But the only interest we have in affirming a participation in Christ's *flesh and blood* is to make it clear that the Saviour whom we receive and with whom we have such communion is an Incarnate Saviour, who died for our sins. The phrases 'eat and drink' and 'flesh and blood' are in strictness *both* symbolical; the former of spiritual assimilation, the latter of our Incarnate Redeemer and our interest in His death."

The same criticism applies to other divines, whether continental or English. While their view is really opposed to any local presence of the natural body and blood of Christ in, with or under the bread and wine, they say so much about our real reception of the body and blood of Christ as to lay themselves open to this interpretation, apart from their distinct statements elsewhere. Thus phrases in the Church Catechism and other formularies, which can usually be paralleled from Calvin, are often taken not merely to admit of Lutheran or High Anglican interpretation, but to teach this and nothing else.[1]

The starting point of non-Lutheran teaching at the Reformation is the Letter of Hoen, itself suggested by the teaching of Wessel Gansfort.[2] A native of Gröningen in Friesland, he was instructed by the Brethren of the Common Life and influenced by Thomas à Kempis. After studying at the university of Cologne, he afterwards worked and taught at Paris and Heidelberg, spending his last years in his native land.

Wessel in no way disputes the current Church doctrine of the Eucharist. But he attaches the greatest importance to its aspect as a remembrance or memorial of Christ, and identifies spiritual eating with believing.

The Lord's commandment, "Do this for remembrance of Me," is the key to the right understanding of the Supper. The remembrance of all the Lord has done in love for us enkindles our love, and thus makes us like to God; it is in this way that Christ's Body feeds us. That the Eucharist may feed unto spiritual life in love, its eating must be a spiritual eating. The Lord says, "Whoso eateth this Bread hath eternal life"; since the outward eating has not this effect, this cannot be the Lord's meaning. Whosoever eats visibly without eating spiritually does not really eat. The Lord taught wherein this spiritual eating consists, by adding at the end of the words of institution, "Do this for My remembrance."[3]

The eating and drinking which He requires as a necessary condition of life cannot be confined to the Sacrament, but must find place everywhere where there is such believing as the Lord requires, for the life is promised to believers. For if no one has life who does not eat His flesh and drink His blood, while he that believeth on Him hath eternal life, we shall be bound to allow that every believer eats His flesh and drinks His blood.[4]

---

[1] See the criticism of E. A. Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (1902), p. 508 f.

[2] For the life and writings of Wessel Gansfort, 1420–1483 (to be carefully distinguished from John of Wesel), *cf.* C. Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation* (Eng. Trans. Edinburgh, 1854, vol. ii).

[3] Dieckhoff, p. 284.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 286.

But Wessel regards Christ as present corporeally, not only in His Deity, in all such cases, and not only in the Eucharist. He is truly present to him who remembers His Name, not only in Godhead, but also in His flesh and blood and whole Manhood.

One of Wessel's chief friends and correspondents was Jacob Hoeck, Dean of Näldwick. On his death, his papers, including a number of Wessel's writings, came into the hands of Cornelius Hoen (Honius) an advocate at the Hague. He was greatly impressed with Wessel's teaching on the Eucharist, which he carried much further, coming to the conclusion that the "est" ("is") in the words of institution stands for "significat" ("means"). He drew up a clear statement of this view, and sent it into Germany along with a collection of Wessel's writings, by his two friends Rode (Rhodius) and Saganus. They came to Luther at Wittenberg, but he was not impressed by the letter. It was however probably seen by Carlstadt, who developed this view in his own way. The envoys went on to Basel, where Œcolampadius commended them to Zwingli at Zurich. Zwingli was already convinced that the words of institution contained a "trope" or figure, but had not seen by what words to express this. But in Hoen's letter he found, to use his own words, the "precious pearl" that "est" should be taken as "significat."

Zwingli first shows acceptance of Hoen's interpretation in a work written in November 1524. In August or September 1525 he published this letter "of a pious and learned Dutchman"—(*Batavus*)—not naming the author. It is most conveniently found among the works of Zwingli,[1] and may be thus summarised: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who often promised His people forgiveness of sins, wishing to confirm their hearts in the Last Supper, added a pledge to His promise, that they might be in no wise doubtful; as a future bridegroom seeking to assure his betrothed gives her a ring, saying, Take, I give myself to thee; and she taking the ring believes him to be hers, and so keeps from all other lovers and thinks only how she may please him. So he who receives the Eucharist, the pledge of this Bridegroom, who testifies that He gives Himself, ought firmly to believe that Christ is his own, given for him, His blood shed for him; wherefore he will turn his heart from all other things and cleave to Christ alone, ever seek to please Him, and cast all his care upon Him. This is truly to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink His blood (John vi. 57)."

---

[1] Egli and Finsler, vol. iv. 512 ff., No. 64.

The schoolmen have not thought of the eating and drinking in living faith. Their view that the consecrated bread is the true body of Christ is overthrown by the fact that this decays. "Also the Lord forbade us to believe men who say, 'Lo here, or there, is Christ'; even so I ought not to give heed to those who say that Christ is in the bread. The Apostles did not speak thus of the Sacrament; they brake bread, called it bread. S. Paul said, 'The bread which we break, is it not a partaking of the Body of Christ?' He did not say, 'It is the Lord's Body.' I wonder why they do not in like manner say that John the Baptist was transubstantiated into Elijah, when Christ said of him, 'This is Elijah'; or John the Evangelist into Christ, since the Lord on the Cross said of him unto His mother, 'Behold thy son!' . . . or the rock into Christ, since Paul said, 'The rock was Christ'.' *Petra erat Christus, id est repraesentabat Christum.* Wherefore we dare not do the same in the present case, especially as He bade us do this for His remembrance, and the remembrance of one absent at least bodily would appear rather than of one present. Customary use, they say, is the reason why in this passage such interpretation offends the ears and not in others, but I can find no reason for the distinction. There are many similar sayings of Christ, *e.g.* I am the true Vine; yet as we are not so precise (*rigidi*) as to say that Christ was a true natural vine, I cannot understand what constrains us in this passage alone, besides the Pope's authority."

The Eucharist is not identical with what it signifies; partaking of it does not exclude from eternal death. The Psalmist says, "Thou wilt not give Thy Holy One to see corruption"; but the consecrated bread is corrupted and eaten by mice, as experience shows; therefore the consecrated bread is not Christ . . . Christ who is perceived by faith alone, worshipped by faith alone, withdrew His bodily presence from His disciples (John xvi. 7). Satan, in order to pervert everything, has sought to persuade of Christ's bodily presence, though not in the form of man but in that of bread. But the bread which is perceived by bodily eyes, if it is believed to be God, demands bodily services; for it would be unfit for God to be inclosed in a lowly dwelling and left inclosed without honour.

Therefore through the words "This is my body," the Saviour did not mean His body to be transubstantiated, but through the bread to give Himself. Just as it is the custom in some places when a seller of land wishes to give possession to the purchaser, he gives him a stick, straw, or stone, and says, "See, I deliver to you the land." So also possession of a house is given by delivery of the keys. So also the Lord through the bread delivers Himself to us as if He had said, "Take and eat and consider it no small thing, because this which I deliver to you signifies My body which I give you by giving this. When therefore this shall be given up or hanged on the cross, it will be for you; nay, all things which I have done or shall do are yours. . . ." Nor is without reason "est" said for "significat," because "est" makes the meaning foretold much more sure and strong; as we say, pointing out a sign of rain, "This is rain," which more surely declares to us rain to come than if we said, "This means rain."

Scripture is full of such expressions; *e.g.* Gen. xl. 12, 18; xli. 26. But the Romans have not been able to give one example for their interpretation, nor to show where Christ is believed to have done a miracle contrary to all experience. He gave sight to the blind, raised the dead, cleansed lepers; but so that they were seen by all as cleansed, living, and seeing, and were not simply believed to be such contrary to all experience.

Let us then distinguish between the bread taken into the mouth and Christ whom we receive by faith. As Dieckhoff says[1], we see the Reformed line of doctrine clearly enough marked out in this letter of Hoen.

Carlstadt, after his breach with Luther in 1523, totally rejected the real presence. Like Wessel, he laid great stress on the remembrance of Christ's work and suffering for us; and also laid emphasis on spiritual eating, not sacramental. But he went so far as to deny that "This is my body" had any relation to the bread of the Eucharist; the Lord pointed to *Himself* as He spoke, referring to His own forthcoming death. This last point won no acceptance at the time, though one finds it held by some at this day; but Carlstadt's other points made a very favourable impression on Bucer and others. Carlstadt, tracing everything to the immediate work of God on the soul, has little room for the "means of grace."

---

[1] P. 298.

Expounding John vi, he affirms that when Christ says that His flesh is the true food from heaven for life, this cannot have been said of the eating of His actual flesh which was to take place in the Sacrament, but must refer to His death on the cross. For it is said of this food that those who enjoy it have the true divine life in themselves; this would not be said of those who eat the sacramental bread, for even Judas did this. Eating the Sacrament admits of death, just as eating the manna from heaven did. Christ on the cross is our food; whoever longs to obtain life in the flesh and blood of Christ must in the Spirit seek Christ uplifted on the cross as food and drink, not in the Sacrament.[1]

The words, "the flesh profiteth nothing," reject entirely any actual eating of Christ's flesh. In the Supper there is no other eating of the flesh of Christ than the spiritual eating involved in the recognition of the death of Christ upon the cross. In opposition to the real presence he maintains that Christ is bodily in heaven, to return only at the end of the world. There is no scriptural ground for assuming a second coming in the Sacrament in distinction from the visible return; we are told of two Advents, not of any third. "When they say"—as the priests do—"here is Christ, or there; go not after them nor follow them."[2]

In the words of institution "This" means not the bread but Christ's living body. After giving the disciples the bread to eat, He promised, pointing to His own body, that He would give up this body for them. In the Celebration, "This is my body" means therefore simply that in receiving the bread we should bear in mind that Christ actually gave up His body on the cross.

Carlstadt's view made a great sensation. In particular, the Strasburg divines, Bucer and Capito, wrote on this subject in 1524. They express their deep regret that the controversy has ever broken out, blame Carlstadt for his attitude towards Luther, and regard the exact nature of what is received as a matter of indifference. But they are—especially Bucer—in essential agreement with Carlstadt apart from his forced interpretation of the words of institution.[1]

---

[1] Dieckhoff, p. 328.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 338.

According to Bucer, the meaning and intent of the sacramental signs should be considered, rather than what they are in themselves. The main point of the Supper is the remembrance, in faith, of the death of Christ. The bread and the cup, whatever they may be, even though the Lord's body and blood, yet would profit nothing by themselves if we did not in fact consider the death of Christ, whereby faith and love would be strengthened or whereby we should spiritually enjoy Christ's flesh and blood, and therefore have eternal life. See to it that you bear in mind Christ's death. Such a remembrance will dispose the whole heart and all its powers to proclaim and praise that death as its redemption, to die to sin and manfully bear the cross.[2]

Bucer does not however merely regard the idea of the real presence as a matter of indifference; he goes on to argue that it is an ungrounded supposition. Christ's words, "Do this for My remembrance," are explained by Paul's "Ye do shew the Lord's death." So the Lord did not command to change the bread into His body, or the like. The mention of His body and blood is meant to remind of the sacrifice once made on the cross. So the spiritual eating of Christ's body and blood, which takes place in the Supper, consists in the right remembrance of the once accomplished death of Christ. The bread and wine serve only to remind of what once took place on the cross. Paul and Luke, when speaking of the cup, clearly meant the blood shed on the cross, through which the new covenant is established. The cup is thus a sign or figure of the new covenant. Then we may take similarly the words used of the bread, "This is my body," and those used by Matthew and Mark of the cup. The bread and cup must be a figure or memento of the true and only body and blood of Christ.

---

[1] Dieckhoff, p. 352 f.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 354.

Bucer compares Gen. xvii. 10–11, where almost consecutively circumcision is called the covenant and a token of the covenant; we have here the "usus loquendi" of the sacrament and its explanation. The "real presence" is also opposed to Christ's words, "It is expedient for you that I go away," and to Paul's, that he no longer knew Christ after the flesh; also to Christ's saying, "The flesh profiteth nothing."[1]

Bucer and Capito, in distinction from Carlstadt, lay stress on the effect which the remembrance of the death of Christ must exercise on the life of the believer. Capito says that by this hope is quickened and faith fed; Bucer speaks constantly of the spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ, whereby faith is strengthened. On the basis of Carlstadt's view of the Supper as an act of remembrance, the spiritual eating of the body and blood of Christ becomes the central point.

Bucer took up an intermediate position between the Saxons and the Swiss. He is the great representative of the Strasburg school. His life was spent in attempts at mediation; but his method was the not very satisfactory one of seeking to get all to agree upon some ambiguous formula, while allowing it to be variously interpreted. The Marburg Conference (1529) between leading representatives of the two parties was largely his work. In view of the coming Diet of Augsburg (1530), he put forward a confession which he hoped all reformers might accept, but it proved acceptable to neither side, and was in the end presented only by four South German cities (the *Confessio Tetrapolitana*). Its statement on this subject is that when we celebrate the Supper, as Christ instituted it, He gives His true body and His true blood to be truly eaten and drunk, for the food of souls whereby they are nourished unto eternal life. Bucer's position may be roughly stated thus: "While the mouth receives the symbols, the bread and wine, the worthy soul receives and feeds upon the reality, the body and blood of Christ. But the unworthy receives the bare elements only."[1] "His own sacramental doctrine had originated as an ingenious attempt to make Zwinglianism acceptable to Luther: although, certainly he came to hold it for its own sake, convinced that . . . he had, as it were, stumbled upon the truth."[2]

---

[1] Dieckhoff, p. 355 f.

Calvin was for some years at Strasburg together with Bucer, and was then regarded as an adherent of the *Augsburg Confession*, though in the modified form in which Melanchthon interpreted it. Had not Calvin's view been largely formed before he left France, we should have reckoned him as a disciple of Bucer, who in any case must have influenced him considerably. The general position of the two on the Eucharist is practically the same, though Bucer is commonly associated with the Germans and Calvin with the Swiss; both lay stress on our true but spiritual reception of Christ's true body and blood. The position of the English Reformers generally is of much the same character.[3] With them, as with Bucer, our experience of communion with Christ in the Supper is brought out. Mr. Smyth seems to prove that Cranmer never held the purely Lutheran view, but passed direct from the Roman to the Bucerian or "Suvermerian" view, and consistently adhered to this.

Bucer's views during his stay in England, 1549–1551, can be best gathered from his *Censura* or criticism of the English Prayer-Book of 1549, which he had been asked (by Bishop Goodrich of Ely) to make, with a view to its revision. A number, though not all, of his suggestions were adopted in the revision of 1552.

He defends the "Prayer of Humble Access" as scriptural according to 1 Cor. x.:

> "We receive therefore here not bread and wine only, but at the same time (*simul*) the body and blood of Christ; and not these things alone, but together (*una*), the whole Christ, God and Man. . . . We receive therefore all these things—the Lord's body and blood, and the whole Lord, God and Man, and the confirmation of the new and eternal covenant with God . . . by faith alone, and therefore with the mind imbued with this faith, by which it

---

[1] A full account of his labours and of his influence in England is given by C. H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI*, ch. v.

[2] Smyth, p. 155.

[3] *Cf.* the statements of Ridley and Bradford, *infra* pp. 181 ff.

> apprehends, holds fast and enjoys Christ Himself, sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and yet presenting Himself to us still living here, and abiding in our hearts."[1]

Discussing the "Prayer of Consecration," he thus writes on the "Words of Institution":

> "The holy Fathers indeed understood no other change of the elements from (*ex*) these words than that by which the bread and wine remaining in all respects in the properties of their own nature (*in suae quidem naturae idiomatis per omnia permanentia*) might be changed from their common or ordinary use, and as it were transelemented (*transelementarentur*), that they might be symbols of such body and blood and moreover (*adeoque*) of Christ Himself, God and Man, the bread which has come down from heaven to give life unto the world; that whosoever might take them according to God's appointment and true faith in Him might receive fuller communion with the Lord (*communionem Domini*), and enjoy Him for food and drink of eternal life, by which they might more and more live in Him and have Him living in them."[2]
>
> "Christ the Lord gives Himself to His faithful ones truly to be enjoyed as food of eternal life, using for this His own words and the symbols of bread and wine; truly therefore do they receive Him by apprehension of faith and spirit, whoever by true faith in Him communicate in these mysteries as He Himself instituted. Therefore in this use of bestowal and reception (*praebitionis et acceptionis*) instituted by Our Lord, the bread and wine are symbols of the body and blood of Christ, by which He offers Himself to us. But outside that use they are what other bread and wine are. For nothing of nature is changed in them, neither is Christ Jesus presented to them, but to believing minds" (*sed fidelibus mentibus*).[3]

Zwingli has given his name to the view ("Zwinglianism") which regards the Sacrament as an act of remembrance, just like a "memorial service" and nothing more. This is certainly the Socinian view as set forth in the *Racovian Catechism* (1605), which states that the Lord's Supper was ordained to proclaim the Lord's death and to give Him thanks, and then adds, "Was there any other reason why the Lord instituted the Supper? No! indeed."[1]

---

[1] *Scripta Anglicana* (1577), p. 473.

[2] p. 471: the general sense is clear, though details are difficult to render.

[3] *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 464.

But it is much disputed whether this was Zwingli's ultimate view. Just as John Wilkes denied that he was ever a Wilkite, and it is now disputed whether Nestorius was actually a Nestorian, so also it is doubtful whether Zwingli was a mere Zwinglian. In his case we have in an aggravated form difficulties which meet us in ascertaining the real and ultimate opinions of other writers. If a man's later writings diverge much from his earlier, does it follow that the earlier ones may be entirely disregarded, or does some of their outlook persevere still in the background? In the heat of controversy a man is much more likely to emphasise his disagreement with his opponents than any points of agreement, and he may well use arguments suiting his immediate purpose which may if pursued overthrow more than he intends. On the other hand when agreement is in view, he may well accept statements compatible with his own views, but not clearly expressing them, statements which he himself would have worded otherwise.

Zwingli's theological career falls into three periods:—The early period, before the outbreak of his controversy with Luther in 1524. The period of the controversy up to, but not including, the Conference of Marburg (1529). The final period, from the Conference to his death at Kappel (1531). It is to the middle period of controversy with Luther that his "Zwinglian" statements mostly belong; in the other two there are statements which go beyond this. In judging of the earlier teaching we must remember that Zwingli himself later acknowledged that in this period he had exercised caution and reserve, not fully expressing his own opinions, so that incidental repetition of traditional language does not go for much.

The first important statement is contained in the eighteenth of the Articles prepared for the *First Zurich Disputation* (1523). This runs:

"Christ who once offered Himself on the cross is a

---

[1] Nonne alia causa ob quam coenam instituit Dominus ? Nulla prorsus.

> sacrifice and victim making satisfaction for ever for the sins of all believers. Whence it is inferred that the Mass is not a sacrifice but a commemoration of the sacrifice once offered upon the cross, and as it were a seal of the redemption bestowed through Christ."[1]

Elsewhere in his earlier writings he says that in the Lord's Supper there is a feeding of the body and blood of Christ made in the remembrance of Him, with showing forth of His death and thanksgiving for the great benefit won thereby for us. The eating and drinking meant in John vi consist in faith in Christ as our Redeemer. Whosoever believes that Christ's body and blood were given for our life, to him Christ's flesh and blood have become food.

The bread and wine are signs of this—that we may be assured in our faith by a visible action. So in his letter to Wyttenbach, "that the mind, taught inwardly by the Spirit of God, yet weighed down by the body, might by a visible sign be rendered more sure and glad" (*certior et laetior*).[2]

The bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ only in an inexact sense (*per catachresin*), as signs of the way in which these feed our souls. The outward action is a "demonstratio" of what takes place inwardly by faith. Hence it is good for the spirit to have also an outward visible sign of its faith "that the ordinary mind also may become by the testimony of sense more certain and happy."[3]

The object of faith is not bread and wine, but the redeeming death of Christ. The bread does not redeem us, nor does the wine make our heart spiritually glad; but the faith which is commanded to be placed on His body and blood wherewith He redeemed us. Hence faith is needed in order to derive any benefit; and the effect of the Supper is the strengthening of faith. Whatever takes place there takes place by divine power, although the mode in which God comes upon the soul is quite unknown to us; believers alone feel it.

As Dr. Barclay says, "In this first period Zwingli attributes objective value to the Supper. The believer really receives something . . . a strengthening and increasing his faith and a sense and consciousness of a more intimate union and communion with God."[1]

---

[1] Egli, Finster and Köhler, i. 460. [2] *Ibid.* viii. 86.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 86, ut rustica mens, sensus quoque testimonio certior fiat et hilarior.

The influence of Hoen's letter first appears in Zwingli's letter to Alber, pastor at Reutlingen, in November 1524.[2] The occasion was the controversy aroused by Carlstadt; Zwingli, while pointing out his errors yet agrees with him in not taking the words of institution literally. On account of this work Luther, up to the Marburg Conference, always classed Zwingli with Carlstadt and the fanatics. The work was not actually sent to Alber, and was circulated for some time in MS.

Zwingli agrees with those who hold that in John vi. Christ is not treating of the Sacrament. Yet the passage is very much to the point. Christ's flesh is food only as slain for us; it makes him who relies on His death a son of God. "None will live save him who will believe Me to have been delivered to death for his salvation." Christ speaks throughout of *faith*, not of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Zwingli emphasises "the flesh profiteth nothing"; this sets aside all conceptions of the essential body of Christ in the Sacrament; should we say that Christ gave that which profiteth nothing? "This word is a barrier (*obex*) by which we may shut out all the efforts of those who speak of the essential body of Christ." The words which Christ speaks, which are spirit and life, mean "the faith that is certain that Christ crucified is our redemption and salvation." Christ by "eat" means "believe."[3]

In the words of institution he rejects Carlstadt's construction. But the whole matter turns on a very short syllable, viz. the word "est" ("is"), which is to be taken in the sense of "significat" ("means"). "We think we may consider the heart of this thing in the shortest of words, namely in this word "is," of which the meaning is not always received as "to be," but as "to signify."[4] He compares Gen. xli. 26, where clearly "are" stands for "mean" or "portend"; so John xv. 1, Luke viii. 11; such expressions may be seen constantly in Holy Writ. So it is with the words of institution; "This means My body which is given for you." "This which I now bid you do will signify or remind of My body which is already being given for you." So Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 26. Since the Lord's Supper was instituted in order that we may recall to mind Christ's death which He endured for us, it is clear that it is the sign by which those who trust in Christ's death and blood prove that they share this faith with their brethren.[1] Thus the sense of Christ's words becomes most clear: "This feast means, or is a symbol by which ye will call to mind (*refricabitis*) that the body of Me, the Son of God, your Lord and Master, has been given for you."

---

[1] *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, p. 47.

[2] Egli, Finsler, iii. 322 ff.

[3] *Ibid.* iii. 341.

[4] Nos cardinem huius rei in brevissima syllaba versare arbitramur, videlicet in hoc verbo 'est,' cuius significantia non perpetuo pro 'esse' accipitur, sed etiam pro 'significare.'

Luke's words as to the cup mean that the New Testament has its strength and foundation in Christ's blood. The cup is the testament, *i.e.* the communication of the quickening, outpouring of Christ's blood. By these words of Luke a key is afforded to unlock those of Matthew and Mark. "This is my blood" means, "This cup is a symbol, or will signify to you, that this My blood has been shed for you."

Christ, now near His death, wishing to leave us a rite in memory of the fact that He had been cruelly slain for us, took bread and commanded that all should eat of it, for this was a symbol to His faithful ones that the body of their God and Lord and Master had been slain; therefore this ought to be done for memory of Him, that we also should likewise eat and commemorate His grace. So of the cup. It has therefore come to pass among Christ's disciples that whoever confess themselves to be brethren, so according to Christ's institution, eat and drink with the other brethren; and in this method they were received into the communion of the brethren who believed themselves redeemed by the body and blood of Christ.[2]

It is clear that the eating of the Eucharist does not take away sins, but is a token (*symbolum*) of those who firmly believe that sin has been overwhelmed (*exhaustum*) and blotted out by Christ's blood, and so give thanks.

Thus Zwingli here regards the Eucharist as a pledge of joint belief in redemption by Christ's death. It is a grateful acknowledgment of the benefits, especially the forgiveness of sins, won by Christ's death, and a bond of union between all believers in this.

---

[1] Fratribus eam fidem habere mutuo probant.

[2] Egli, Finsler, iii. 351.

His most systematic statement of theology is his *De Vera et Falsa Religione Commentarius* (March 1525).[1] In the section on the Eucharist we have naturally an expansion of the Epistle to Alber. "In the Lord's Supper we give a proof (*experimentum*) that we trust in Christ's death, when thankfully and joyfully we join in that company which gives thanks to God for the blessing of redemption."[2] "Eucharist," thanksgiving, is a most suitable name; Christ willed in the Supper joyful remembrance of Himself to be made and thanks to be publicly given for the blessing He bestowed on us.[3] Zwingli goes through the discourse in John vi. at length, making clear that Christ is not here speaking of sacramental eating. "Christ in this chapter by 'bread' and 'eat' means nothing else than 'gospel' and 'believe'; he who believes that He was sacrificed for us and trusts in Him, has eternal life."[4] He says repeatedly that Christ gives salvation as slain, not as eaten (*non esus sed caesus*). "My flesh is truly food and My blood truly drink" means the flesh of Christ as given in death for our redemption, and His blood as shed in death for our cleansing.[5] "The flesh of Christ is in every way of the greatest, nay of immeasurable benefit; but as we said, through being slain, not through being consumed. When slain it preserved us from death, but when eaten it is of no benefit whatever."[6] He lays the greatest stress on the words, "The flesh profiteth nothing," calling this "a brazen wall" against all hostile engines,[7] and "unbreakable adamant" (*infractus adamas*).[8]

He entirely rejects the distinction "We eat indeed the true and corporeal flesh of Christ, but spiritually." To be a body and to be eaten spiritually are inconsistent. If it is spirit it cannot be a body. To eat corporeal flesh spiritually is nothing else than to assert that what is body is spirit.[9] After rejecting Carlstadt's interpretation of "This," he says that the whole difficulty lies not in this word but in "est" ("is"), which in Scripture sometimes signifies "means." As before, he instances Gen. xli. 26–27, Luke viii. 11–15, Matthew xiii. 38–39. The figurative or applied sense of a word is often higher than the literal.[1]

---

[1] Egli, Finster, iii. pp. 590 ff. [2] *Ibid.* p. 761. [3] *Ibid.* p. 775.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 779. [5] *Ibid.* p. 780.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 782, Caro Christi omni modo plurimum imo immensum, prodest, sed, ut diximus, caesa non ambesa. Caesa nos servavit a caede, sed comesa poenitus nihil prodest.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 785. [8] *Ibid.* p. 816. [9] *Ibid.* p. 787.

All fit together if we take "is" for "means." So in Luke xxii. 19, "This means My body which is given for you." "This which I present you to eat is a symbol of My body given for you."[2] The Lord's Supper is a commemoration of Christ's death, not a remission of sins, for this belongs to Christ's death alone.

Zwingli here lays such stress on "commemoration" as to ignore all other meaning or benefit of the Eucharist. "The Eucharist is no other than a commemoration by which those who firmly believe themselves to be reconciled to the Father by the death and blood of Christ, announce this life—giving death, that is they praise, give thanks and preach."[3] Such phrases, all belonging to the middle part of his career, have gained the name "Zwinglian" for the doctrine of a mere commemorative feast.

A few points are dealt with most fully in his *Subsidium sive Coronis de Eucharistia* (August 1525):[4]

> "The disciples were not troubled when Christ spoke of what He had just metaphorically called His blood as wine or the fruit of the vine. It is clear from this very tranquillity of theirs that they rightly understood His speech as symbolical. They were accustomed both to Christ's language and to the symbolism of commemoration. They had often kept the Passover, where similar language is used. If we accept a trope here, all is clear, nothing is repugnant either to faith or to common sense or to the character of Scripture, which is full of tropes. Of this class of metaphor all writings and speech are full, so that we cannot dispense with them even in every day discourse."[5]

At the meeting of the Senate of Zurich, April 1525, when it was proposed to abolish the Mass, Zwingli was opposed by the Secretary, Joachim am Grüt, who declared his interpretation to be a new sophistry, and denied that his examples of metaphorical language were really parallel; they all came from parables, whereas the words of institution are a plain statement. Zwingli answered this charge, but felt its force. Near the close of the next night he had a dream that some one said to him, "Why do you not answer that in Exodus xii. it is written, 'It is the Passover.'" He at once sprang from bed and looked up the passage, which he quoted with great effect next day. Its strength of course lies firstly in the connection of the Eucharist with the Passover; secondly, in the memorial of a fact or event being spoken of as the fact itself. Zwingli does not in this work attach too much importance to the dream; I relate nothing more important than a dream" (*nihil altius quam somnium narro*). We may perhaps compare Thackeray, unable to select a title for his novel, hearing a voice under precisely similar conditions, "Why don't you call it 'Vanity Fair'?" Psychologists would speak of the workings of the sub-conscious mind.

---

[1] Egli, Finster, iii. p. 795 f.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 798.

[3] *Ibid.* 807, Est ergo eucharistia . . . . sive caena dominica nihil aliud quam commemoratio, qua ii, qui se Christi morte et sanguine firmiter credunt patri reconciliatos esse, hanc vitalem mortem annunciant, hoc est: landant, gratulantur et praedicant.

[4] *Ibid.* iv. 458 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 471.

We may pass over the controversy with Luther, noting only that the Conference at Marburg was by no means a complete failure. The two parties came to understand one another better; agreement was reached on points other than the Eucharist. And it would seem that here Melanchthon was so far impressed by the arguments of Œcolampadius that his composition, the *Augsburg Confession*, does not express Luther's full view, even in its original form (1530), much less in the *Variata* of 1540.[1]

The final statement of Zwingli's views appears in the *Expositio Christianæ Fidei*, addressed to Francis I, King of France. It again emphasises the symbolical interpretation of the Eucharist, which constituted the special contribution of the Reformation era to the statement of eucharistic doctrine. In this, indeed, there was nothing new, the Reformation merely called a return to the symbolism of Augustine, like Berengar in the eleventh century. Zwingli grounds his doctrine in the interpretation of the Sacraments as "signs and symbols of sacred things," they are the "significations of true things, which were once wrought essentially and naturally; these things they bring back, commemorate, and, as it were, set before our eyes." The object of this commemoration is Christ's death, for "the Eucharist is now a commemoration of this fact."[1]

---

[1] For details of the Conference, *cf*. Barclay, pp. 88 ff., and Mackinnon, iii. 320 ff.

But Zwingli does not confine eucharistic symbolism to a mere commemorative action. His symbolism is not bare. The consecrated bread and wine are "the symbolical body of Christ."[2] "Thus by the very symbols, bread and wine, Christ Himself is as it were presented to our eyes, that no longer hearing alone, but also sight and taste may see and perceive Christ."[3] The consecrated elements are possessed of virtue, and have a value. "They stand for the things which they signify, from which also they derive their names"[4] . . . which (symbols) we value . . . according to the greatness of the thing signified, so as to be no longer common bread but sacred, nor to have the name only of bread but also of the body of Christ, nay to be Christ's body, but by name and signification, which moderns call "sacramentally."[5]

On the other hand he carefully guards against the realist tendency of the Lutheran divines. He draws a clear distinction between the effective virtue of the Sacrament and the body of Christ which is in heaven. "Who could be so ignorant as to say that the sign is what it signifies?"[6] Christ's body cannot be set before the eyes. "In the Lord's Supper that natural and substantial body of Christ by which He suffered here and now sits in heaven at the right hand of the Father, it is not eaten naturally or in essence, but only spiritually."[7] Christ is apprehended in the Eucharist by the mind,[8] and "to eat sacramentally Christ's body is, when we mean to speak precisely (*proprie*), along with the Sacrament to eat the body of Christ in mind and spirit."[9] "We are therefore compelled whether we will or no, to recognise that these words 'This is my body' are not to be understood naturally and in the precise sense of the words, but symbolically (*symbolice*), sacramentally (*sacramentaliter*), or by metonymy, *i.e.* 'This is my body,' that is, 'This is the

[1] Niemeyer, p. 39 (15). [2] *Ibid.* p. 48 (66), symbolicum Christi corpus.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 39 (15). [4] *Ibid.* p. 51 (76). [5] *Ibid.* p. 51 (77).
[6] *Ibid.* p. 39 (15). [7] *Ibid.* p. 44 (47).
[8] *Ibid.* pp. 47ff. (64–68). [9] *Ibid.* pp. 47 (64).

Sacrament of My body.' "[1] "We assert therefore that the body of Christ is not then carnally and crudely (*crasse*) eaten in the Supper . . . but . . . sacramentally and spiritually."[2]

Thus we see in Zwingli's final utterance positive statements of the value of the Lord's Supper, showing that he did not merely or finally hold the view commonly called Zwinglian. Dr. Barclay[3] maintains that in Zwingli's first period there are positive elements in his teaching; in the second period during the conflict with Luther, the negative element was predominant; but towards the end of his life, under the mediating influence of Bucer, he returned to the more positive views which he held at the outset. "It seems to be certain, not only from Zwingli's own language, but from the unvarying testimony of his nearest followers, that that remarkable man, one of the most attractive and original of the characters of the Reformation, was far indeed from teaching a cold and empty doctrine of the Holy Communion."[4]

Most recent investigators indeed tend to hold that at least finally Zwingli's view was akin to that of Bucer and Calvin, and, we may add, to that of Cranmer and the English Reformers generally; he rejected any corporeal presence, but maintained a true spiritual presence grasped by faith. In the recent discussion between Bauer and Köhler,[5] Bauer holds this to have been Zwingli's true view all along, so that he is the precursor of Bucer and Calvin; only in his controversy with Luther he laid such stress upon the figurativeness of the words of institution that this has commonly been taken to represent his entire doctrine. Köhler however holds that his doctrine developed from the vague mystical view of Erasmus through the purely figurative one of Carlstadt and Hoen to that represented by Bucer—a true-presence to faith. (*Fiducials-präsenz*).

Zwingli was killed at the battle of Kappel (1531), and so he exerted no influence on the two *Confessions of Basel*, drawn up in 1534 and 1536 respectively. The former was probably planned originally by Œcolampadius, but was revised by his successor Myconius. If Zwingli's public statements on sacramental doctrine had brought discredit upon the Swiss reformers, no such result could follow from the clear statement of the *First Confession of Basel*: "We firmly believe that Christ Himself is the food of believing souls to eternal life, and that our souls by true faith in Christ crucified are fed and refreshed (*potari*) by the body and blood of Christ (*Disputatio XVI*). Also we confess that Christ in His holy Supper is present to all who truly believe" (cap. 17).[1]

---

[1] Niemeyer, p. 53 (83). [2] *Ibid.* p. 72 (164).

[3] *Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, p. 43. *Cf. supra.* p. 162.

[4] Bishop Handley Moule, *Ridley on the Lord's Supper*, p. 350; *Cf.* also Dr. Anderson Scott, *Expositor*, 1901, pp. 161 ff.

[5] *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xlvi (1927) and xlvii (1928).

No less explicit was the *Second Confession of Basel*, known also as *The First Helvetic Confession*, framed by Bullinger, Myconius and Grynaeus. "These symbols of hidden things consist not of bare signs, but of signs and things together. . . . In the Eucharist the bread and wine are signs, but the *thing* is the communication of the Lord's body . . . (cap. 21).[2] The Eucharist is the mystical Supper wherein the Lord presents His body and blood, that is Himself, truly to His own, in order that He may more and more live in them and they in Him. Not that the Lord's body and blood are either actually united with the bread and wine, or are included here locally, or brought here by carnal presence, but that the bread and wine, according to our Lord's institution, are symbols by which the Lord Himself, through the ministry of the church, is presented as a true communication of the body and blood" . . . (cap. 23).[3] Thus the Swiss there defended themselves against the charge of making too little of sacred symbols.

But mistrust of the Swiss continued, and the challenge was taken up by Bullinger (1504–1575). He succeeded Zwingli at Zurich, and thus represents the earlier Swiss reformers, and interprets the uncertainties or inconsistencies of Zwingli. Bullinger also had a close connection with England and constant intercourse with English reformers, both earlier and later; his name repeatedly occurs as receiving letters from them.[4] He dedicated the Second Book of his *Decades* (1550) to Edward VI, and the Fifth, including the sermons on the Sacraments, to Henry Grey, Marquess of Dorset (1551). The complete series (Five

---

[1] Niemeyer, p. 95. [2] *Ibid.* p. 120. [3] *Ibid.* p. 120f.

[4] *Cf. Original Letters and Zurich Letters* (Parker Society).

Books of Ten Sermons each) were translated into English in 1577, new editions appearing 1583 and 1584.

Bullinger says:

> "Our opponents object that we evacuate and make of none effect the sacraments, that we teach that the faithful receive in them nothing but bare water and bare bread and wine. . . . But if by 'bare' they mean things of no force, we openly profess that we have Sacraments which are holy and not profane, effectual and not without force, full not void or empty. . . . In the church, with the godly and faithful they work the same effect and end whereunto they were ordained of God . . . water, bread and wine, being used in the celebration of the Sacraments . . . differ very far from what they were before and are sacraments signed of God by His Word. . . .[1]
>
> Sacramental signs also signify, and in signifying also represent[2] . . . in the Lord's Supper bread and wine represent the very body and blood of Christ. As the bread nourisheth and strengtheneth man and giveth him ability to labour, so the body of Christ eaten by faith feedeth and satisfieth the soul of man. . . .[3] I confess . . . that spiritual divine and quickening presence of our Lord Christ, both in the Supper and also out of the Supper."[4]

Holy Communion sets up a spiritual union analagous to the process of physical metabolism, "as the substance of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of man's body, even so Christ, being eaten of the godly by faith is united unto them by His Spirit[5]—a statement reminiscent of Justin Martyr.

On the other hand, Bullinger makes no concession to Lutheran demands for the doctrine of the real presence. "To represent doth not signify to bring, give or make that now again corporally present which sometime was taken away." . . .[6] "I am flat against that bodily presence of Christ in the bread,"[7] notwithstanding the words of institution, which must be sought out in "the true sense of the Lord's words."[8] Christ's words are not to be taken literally, as some maintain. "Necessity, therefore, constrains us to confess that in some places we must forsake the letter but not the sense:"[1]

---

[1] Bullinger, *Decades*, v. 313 f. (I have not always followed the translation given.)

[2] *Ibid*. p. 327.

[3] *Ibid*. p. 329.

[4] *Ibid*. p. 452.

[5] *Ibid*. p. 330.

[6] *Ibid*. p. 327.

[7] *Ibid*. p. 452.

[8] *Ibid*. v. 435.

> "The Lord sitting at the very same table with His disciples, reached the bread unto them with His own hand. And He having only one true human and natural body, with that very same body of His delivered bread unto His disciples, and not a body, either of any other man's or that of His own.[2] . . . Therefore these solemn words . . . can have no other sense than this: 'This is a commemoration, memorial or remembrance (*memoraculum, memoriale vel memoria*) sign or sacrament, of My body which is given for you; this cup, or rather, the wine in the cup, signifieth or representeth unto you My blood which was once shed for you. . ."[3]

It "was not our Saviour's meaning by these words to unite or make His body of the bread; for if He had meant so to do verily it had been done.[4] . . . If the word 'est' is to be understood substantively, it follows that the bread is changed unto Christ's body. But that this is not so all our senses bear witness, the very substance remaining, not only the accidents of the bread"[5]—a statement which might have issued from the lips of Berengar, and he continues with another Berengarian conception, "in this matter to avoid absurdity we willingly admit a trope." Commenting on S. John vi. he says that "here by a trope or allegory He biddeth us eat and drink the flesh of Christ to everlasting life." To eat and drink is to believe, and the content of the feast is a "most certain assurance and feeling of heavenly things received within us." Unlike some other interpreters he draws a distinction between spiritual and sacramental feeding. Spiritual feeding is perpetual because faith permanently unites with Christ. Sacramental feeding is intermittent, and is confined to celebrating the Lord's Supper.

Calvin forms a link between the German and the Swiss divines. While minister at Strasburg (1538–1541) he subscribed to the *Augsburg Confession*; this however did not mean that he, any more than Bucer, accepted Luther's special view of the Eucharist. Even in the Latin form of the original *Confession* this was only vaguely expressed. "They teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are communicated to the eaters in the Lord's Supper, and they blame those who teach otherwise."[1] But in the edition of 1540 (the *Variata*) Melanchthon modified this greatly: "that with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly shown to the eaters."[2] . . . the final clause being omitted. The article is so changed that Calvin could give it his hearty consent, and even Zwingli with the exception perhaps of the word "truly," might have admitted it. Calvin himself says that he accepted the *Augsburg Confession* in the sense in which its author (Melanchthon) interpreted it.

---

[1] *Decades*, p. 437.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 438.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 439.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 443.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 444.

On the other hand Calvin came to an agreement with the divines of Zurich, accepted shortly by most of Switzerland, in the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549). This was welcomed by Melanchthon, and for a moment seemed likely to unite the Reformers. But Westphal and other extreme Lutherans denounced it together with other opinions of Melanchthon, and their view was firmly established as the Lutheran doctrine in the *Formula of Concord* (1577).

Calvin is decidedly opposed not only to Transubstantiation but to any theory which unites the body and blood of Christ locally with the elements; and strongly maintains in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of its "ubiquity," that the Lord's body and blood are only in heaven. But he nevertheless maintains that we receive this truly in the Sacrament, although in different ways. Sometimes, he declares, the Holy Spirit can unite things far removed locally; sometimes, Christ communicates His body as power or energy; sometimes, we ascend in heart to heaven. He lays the greatest stress on our real participation in the actual flesh and blood of Christ. But as Dr. Mackintosh says,[3] "In all this there is, indeed, nothing to object to were it made clear simultaneously . . . that after all what 'flesh and blood' mean is not some undefinable substance, but simply Christ Himself, as a person, Incarnate and Crucified, and clothed in the Gospel of His death." Neither Luther nor Calvin are content "that in the Sacrament we have Christ Himself; we must besides have His flesh and blood in some substantial and quasi-material sense. . . . When Calvin goes beyond the objective reality of the presence of Christ to affirm the presence of Christ's flesh and blood as something more, and more precious, we detect the traces of his age."

---

[1] Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 241, . . . docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in Caena Domini; et improbant secus docentes.

[2] quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus.

[3] *Expositor* (1903), p. 194.

No writer among the Swiss reformers was more under the influence of Augustinian sacramental teaching than Calvin. While, on the one hand, he gives a clear statement of Augustinian symbolism, on the other he incorporates much of Augustine's realist language. This is the key to an adequate interpretation of Calvin's doctrine:

> "To deny that a true communication of Jesus Christ is presented to us in the Supper is to render the holy Sacrament frivolous and useless.[1] If His words, John vi. 55, are not to go for nothing, it follows that in order to have our life in Christ our souls must feed on His body and blood as their proper food.[2] For some define that to eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood is nothing else than to believe in Christ Himself. But I conceive that Christ intended to teach us something more striking and sublime, *viz.* that we are quickened by a real (*vera participatione*) partaking of Him, which He designated by the terms 'eating' and 'drinking' that none might suppose that life we receive from Him to be received by mere knowledge. . . . The Lord by calling Himself the bread of life intended to teach not only that salvation is laid up for us by faith in His death and resurrection, but also that by true participation (*vera communicatione*) in Him it comes to pass that life passes into us and becomes ours, just as bread when taken as food communicates vigour to the body."[3]

If, therefore, like Justin Martyr he makes use of physical feeding as an illustration of the feeding of the soul, yet his conception suggests no application of the principle to the sacramental elements. There is no metabolism of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ. "There is no transubstantiation; the nature of the Sacrament requires the material bread to remain as a visible sign of the body.[1] Nor is there such presence as to enclose the body within the sign, or join it to it locally."[2]

---

[1] *De Cœna Domini*, Cap. 12. (*Tracts*, ii. 170.)

[2] *Ibid.* cap. 13. (*Tracts* ii. 170) *cf. Inst.* Lib. iv. cap. 17, 7. (Tholuck, ii. 404 f.)

[3] *Institutes* Lib., iv. cap. xvii, 5 (Tholuck ii. 403 f.) *cf.* xvii. 10.

So we arrive at his fundamental idea:

> "The bread and wine are signs (*signa*) which represent to us the invisible nourishment which we receive from the flesh and blood of Christ."[3] . . . "By reason of the affinity which the things signified have with the symbols, we profess that the name of the substance has been given to signs. . . . This is the metonymical form of expression, which is constantly used in Scripture in reference to mysteries. Bread is here called Christ's body, because it is the symbol by which the Lord offered us the true eating of His body (as Augustine taught).[4] For if it had not been recognised by the apostles that the bread was called His body figuratively (*figurate*), because it was the symbol of His body, they would undoubtedly have been troubled at such an extraordinary thing."[5]

If, therefore, realism enters into some of his language, it is not part of his theory of the Sacrament, and he expressly repudiates the realist view:

> "According to them there is no communion unless they swallow the flesh of Christ under the bread. . . . They falsely pretend that all that we teach about spiritual eating is opposed to truth and what they call real (*reali*) eating, since we consider only the mode of eating, which with them is carnal since they include Christ with the bread; to us, it is spiritual, because the secret power of the Spirit is the bond of our conjunction with Christ."[6]

On the other hand, even less than Zwingli can Calvin be numbered among the Sacramentarians. "Those who eat Christ's body sacramentally only are deprived of true and real eating, because the body cannot be separated from its virtue."[1] If the "communion we have in the body and blood of the Lord Jesus . . . is figured to us in visible signs . . . it is not a bare figure but is combined with the reality and substance."[2] The sacramental elements mediate for us the "efficacy" of Christ's sacrifice.[3] "When I say that Christ is received by faith, I do not mean that He is conceived merely by understanding and imagination; for the promises present Him to us not that we may stop with the sight and bare knowledge, but that we may enjoy a real participation (*vera communicatione*) of Him . . . in the mystery of the Supper through the symbols of bread and wine Christ is truly exhibited to us . . . that firstly we may be united into one body with Him, and secondly that being made partakers of His substance (*participes substantiæ ejus*), we may experience His power in the participation (communicatione) of all blessings."[4]

---

[1] *De Cœna Domini*, cap. 39 (*Tracts*, ii. 185 f.).
[2] *Ibid.* 41 (*Tracts* ii. 187).
[3] *Inst.* Lib. iv. cap. xvii. 1 (Tholuck ii. 401).
[4] *Ibid.* Lib. iv. cap. xvii. 21 (Tholuck ii. 415).
[5] *Ibid.* Lib. iv. cap. xvii. 23 (Tholuck ii. 417).
[6] *Ibid.* Lib. iv. cap. xvii. 33 (Tholuck ii. 426 f.).

Calvin's interpretation of the Eucharist was an attempt to deal with the controversy among the Reformers, pointing out very fairly the faults of Luther on the one hand and Zwingli and Œcolampadius on the other. He appeals to ground common to them all, "we all confess with our mouth that in receiving the Sacrament in faith, according to the Lord's ordinance, we are truly made partakers of the body and blood of Jesus Christ," although, he contends, some may explain better than others how this comes to pass.

The *Confessions* put out by the Reformed churches after the teaching of Calvin became dominant show undoubted signs of his influence. In the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549), an agreement was reached between the church of Geneva, represented by Calvin, and the other Swiss churches, especially Zurich, represented by Bullinger.[5] Bishop Moule maintained that this *Consensus* is in some important particulars one of the ablest and wisest statements ever made on this great subject.[6] After describing the objects of sacraments,[7] the *Consensus* continues:

"The Lord has given no true testimonies and signs of

---

[1] *Inst.*, Lib. iv., cap. xvii. 34 (Tholuck ii. 430).

[2] *De Cœna Domini*, 15 (Tracts ii. 171).

[3] *Inst.*, Lib. iv., cap. xvii. 1 (Tholuck ii. 401 ff.).

[4] *Ibid.* Lib. iv., cap. xvii. 11 (Tholuck ii. 407).

[5] *Cf.* Niemeyer, pp. 390 ff.

[6] *Op. cit.*, 366. [7] Cap. 7.

His grace; yet doubtless He Himself bestows inwardly by His Spirit what the Sacraments figure to the eyes and the other senses; that is, that we may enjoy Christ as the source of all grace."[1]

"Though we distinguish between the signs and the things signified, yet we do not disjoin the truth from the signs; nay we acknowledge that all who by faith embrace the promises there offered, spiritually receive Christ with His spiritual gifts."[2]

"It befits us not to look to the bare signs, but rather to the promise annexed to them."[3]

"Nothing is received in the Sacraments but by faith; but the grace of God is not so bound but every one who has the sign has also the reality. It is certain that Christ is offered to all with His gifts . . . but all are not receptive (*capaces*) of Christ and His gifts."[4]

The *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563) was drawn up by Ursinus and Olevianus at the instigation of the Elector Palatine Frederick III. It has had the widest circulation of all the "Reformed" catechisms. The contemporary Latin translation differs here and there markedly from the original German. Out of 129 questions and answers, numbers 65–88 are on the Sacraments, 75–85 on the Lord's Supper.[5] Christ "Himself feeds and refreshes my soul to eternal life with His crucified body and shed blood, as certainly as I receive from the minister's hand and taste bodily the Lord's bread and cup, which are given to me as certain tokens of the body and blood of Christ."[6] Eating the crucified body of Christ and drinking His shed blood "means not only to embrace with believing heart the whole passion and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain forgiveness of sins and eternal life, but moreover through the Holy Spirit, which dwells alike in Christ and in us, to be so more and more united with His blessed body that we, although He is in heaven and we on earth, yet are flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone, and continually live and are governed by one Spirit, as the members of one body by one soul."[7]

The bread and wine do not become the actual (*wesentliche*) body and blood of Christ, but, "as the water in baptism is not converted into Christ's blood, nor itself becomes the washing away of sins, of which it is only a divine token and pledge; so also the holy bread in the Supper does not become the body of Christ itself, although it according to the character and usage of the Sacraments is named the body of Christ."[1] Christ calls the bread His body and the cup His blood to assure us through "their visible sign and pledge that we are truly partakers of His true body and blood by the operation of the Holy Ghost as we receive these holy tokens, with our bodily mouths, in remembrance of Him."[2]

---

[1] Cap. 8. [2] Cap. 9. [3] Cap. 10. [4] Cap. 18.

[5] *Cf.* Niemeyer, pp. 390 ff.; Schaff, i. 531 ff.; iii. 332 ff.

[6] Ques. 75. [7] Ques. 76.

Of the English Reformers, it will suffice to quote Tyndale, Hooper, Ridley, Bradford, Cranmer, and Jewel, with Hooker to sum up the Elizabethan doctrine. Cranmer and Jewel deal with the subject at great length; but much of their work consists of quotations or expositions of patristic passages. This was fully necessary at the time, in order to refute the charge of absolute novelty, or to show their opponents to be wrong in interpreting the vague language of various Fathers as implying acceptance of Transubstantiation.

In his work on the Sacraments[3] Tyndale describes the three current opinions on the words of institution—the Roman, the German and the Swiss. The Swiss state "that these sayings, This is My body, and This is My blood, showing bread and wine, are true as Christ meant them, and as the people of that country to whom Christ spoke were accustomed to understand such words. The Romans and the Germans allege also other texts "which not only do not strengthen their case, but rather make it worse, as the Sixth of John, which they draw and wrest to the carnal and fleshly eating of Christ's body in the mouth, when it only meaneth of this eating by faith. For when Christ said, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you, this cannot be understood of the Sacrament."[4]

In another work, *The Supper of the Lord,*[5] which was not however certainly written by Tyndale, the author more closely associates S. John vi with the Eucharist. "Christ's flesh, which He called bread, is the spiritual food and meat of our souls when our souls by faith see God the Father not to have spared His own dear Son . . . then have we eaten His flesh and drunk His blood."[1] "Christ said: My flesh profiteth nothing; meaning to eat it bodily. This is the key that solveth all their (the Papist's) arguments."[2] Then he returns to the words of institution. "Neither let it offend that 'est' is taken for 'significat' . . . for this is the common manner of speech in many places of scripture and also in our mother tongue; as when we see pictures or images, which you will know are but signs to represent the bodies whom they be made like."[3] "Christ's glorified body is not in this world, but in heaven."[4]

---

[1] Ques. 78. [2] Ques. 79.

[3] *Doctrinal Treatises* (Parker Society), pp. 345 ff.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 368 f.

[5] *Cf. Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue* (Parker Society), pp. 222 ff.

Hooper's *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book* dates from 1547, during his stay at Zurich, and thus obviously reflects the Swiss school of theology. But the difference between it and English writings is by no means marked. Following Swiss terminology, he interprets the words of institution in a representative sense—"although He said that the wine was His blood and the bread His body, He meant none otherwise but that it represented His body."[5] S. Paul taught (1 Cor. x. 16, 17) "that such as did eat of this holy Sacrament . . . were partakers of the spiritual graces and communion of Christ's body and blood, represented by the bread."[6]

But representation means more than mere signification; there is a real content in the representing sacramental symbols: "Which Sacrament is not a bare sign and token of His death only, as many men imagine . . . but I put as much difference between the Sacraments of Christ and all other signs and tokens not appointed for Sacraments, as I do between the seal of a prince that is annexed unto the writing or charter that containeth all the prince's right and title that he hath unto his realm, and the king's arms printed in a glass window. . . . And as the writings sealed doth confirm and declare the right of the owner unto all the world; so doth the Sacraments confirm the assurance of everlasting life unto the faithful, and declareth the same to all the world."[1]

---

[1] *Answer*, p. 227. [2] *Ibid.* p. 239. [3] *Ibid.* p. 249. [4] *Ibid.* p. 253.

[5] *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book* (Parker Society), p. 115.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 151.

The Sacrament makes effective in the form of "virtue" the body and blood of Christ for the faithful recipient by the agency of the Holy Ghost; "faith receiveth the effect of that precious body represented by the Sacrament,"[2] but without being mediated in an actual manner the body of Christ, which remains in heaven; "as the matter, substance, and land itself is not corporally nor really contained in the writing, nor annexed to the writing . . . no more is the corporal body of Christ brought before the Church, neither with the bread, nor in the bread, nor beneath the bread, nor through the bread nor before the bread nor after the bread[3] . . . so doth the merits of this precious body in heaven feed my poor wretched soul upon the earth . . . Christ's body may be in heaven and yet extend his virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost unto my soul, by the means of faith."[4]

Ridley's doctrine of the Sacrament is the interpretation of a man standing on his defence, and anxious, therefore, to retain so much of his opponent's case as did not traverse his own integrity. He contends that his symbolism is not devoid of spiritual content. He does not "take away simply and absolutely the presence of Christ's body and blood from the Sacrament." What he does deny is "the presence of Christ's body in the natural substance of His human and assumed nature," "which remains in heaven" until the last day. But he admits "the presence of the same by grace," which by virtue of its union with the divine nature in the Trinity "hath not only life in itself, but is also able to give and doth give life unto so many as be or shall be partakers thereof." Thus he sets up the Divinity of Christ as the agent of sacramental feeding, through the medium of grace, but without bringing down the Godhead on to the Table, "even as, for example, we say the sun which in substance never removeth his place out of the heavens is yet present here by his beams, light and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth."[5]

---

[1] *Answer*, p. 190 f. [2] *Ibid.* p. 151.

[3] Neque cum pane, neque in pane, neque sub pane, neque per panem. neque ante panem, neque post panem.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 191. [5] *Brief Declaration* (Parker Society), p. 13.

The same emphasis upon "grace" as the sacramental content of spiritual reality imparted in the Eucharist was repeated shortly before he went to the fire at Oxford. Ridley was aware that he was fighting for his life. He therefore strained his language to the utmost in order, if possible, to satisfy the realist theory of his judges: "Both you and I agree herein, that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead." This is the voice of Paschius Radbert, but Ridley quickly dissociates himself from the realist implication of his terminology. "We differ *in modo*, in the way and manner" of the sacramental presence. "I, being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded, confess Christ's natural body to be in the Sacrament indeed by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine receiveth effectuously Christ's body, and drinketh His blood (that is, he is made effectually partaker of His passion)." If the actual body of Christ is truly and really (*vere et realiter*) "in the Sacrament of the altar" it is by "grace and efficacy" only.[1] The sacramental content is therefore limited to the virtue, or grace or efficacy of the body of Christ which remains in heaven, teaching which played a large part in eucharistic interpretation from Augustine through Ratramn to Berengar, and he declines to admit the crude interpretation of realist language maintained by his opponents—"if you mean really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a movable body under the forms of bread and wine, then in that sense is not Christ's body in the Sacrament really and indeed (*realiter et vere*)."[2]

There is no substantial relationship between the bread and the body of Christ; very bread cannot be His body in very substance thereof.[3] So that when "Christ called very bread His body" the words used have another meaning, which is supplied by the words "Do this in remembrance of me." "Christ did take the bread and called it His body, for that He would thereby institute a perpetual remembrance of His body, especially of the singular benefit of our redemption which He would then procure and purchase unto us by His body upon the cross."[1] Consequently the application of the term "body" to the sacramental bread has a soteriological rather than a sacramental purpose. Its object was rather to set up a perpetual memorial of the atoning virtue of Christ's death, than to emphasise eucharistic feeding. The continued existence of the bread after consecration is a proof that no identification of the substance of bread and body has taken place. "But bread retaining still its own very natural substance . . . whereas else the very bread which He took, brake, and gave them, could not be in any wise His natural body, for that were confusion of substance. And therefore the very words of Christ joined with the next sentence following both enforceth us to confess the very bread to remain still. . . ."[2]

---

[1] *Last Examination*, p. 274.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 274.

[3] *Disputations*, p. 15.

No less explicit was he in excluding the doctrine of Transubstantiation: "When Christ said of the bread which He took and after thanks given, brake, and gave them saying, 'Take, eat, this is My body,' He meant no more any such change of the substance of bread into the substance of His natural body than He meant of the change and transubstantiation of the cup into the substance of the new testament." . . . "This word ('is') hath no such strength or signification in the Lord's words, to make or to signify any transubstantiation."[3] In sharpest contrast against the prevailing theory of sacramental metabolism Ridley sets up the doctrine of Augustinian symbolism. Continuing his protest against Transubstantiation he says: "In the Lord's words, whereby He instituted the Sacrament of His blood, he useth a figurative speech. How vain then is it, that some so earnestly do say, as if it were an infallible rule, that in doctrine and in the institution of the Sacraments Christ used no figures, but all His words are to be strained to their proper significations?"[4] He then quotes the rule of Augustine, set out in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, III, 16: "If the Scripture doth seem to command a thing which is wicked or ungodly, or to forbid a thing that charity doth require; then know thou (saith he) that the speech is figurative," a statement which applies to the utterance of

---

[1] *Disputations*, p. 15 f. [2] *Ibid.* p. 15 f. [3] *Ibid.* p. 20. [4] *Ibid.* p. 20.

Christ in John vi. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," which is "a figurative speech."[1] . . . Even so the same passage with the example of S. Augustine's exposition thereof teaches us "not only by the same to understand Christ's words in the institution of the Sacrament, both of His body and of His blood figuratively, but also the very true meaning and understanding of the same.[2] He also appeals to Tertullian's exposition on the sacramental elements as "holy tokens and signs of His body and of His blood."[3]

Bradford's *Sermon on the Lord's Supper* was revised by Ridley and was published in 1579 by Thomas Sampson, one of the early Elizabethan Puritans; thus it represents more than Bradford's personal views. His special contribution is the description of the Sacraments as "exhibitive signs" in contrast with mere significative signs.

Beginning with a series of arguments against Transubstantiation he, like Ridley, adheres firmly to the Berengarian maxim that after consecration the substance of bread and wine remains.[4] He then passes to a denial of bare or empty symbolism "lest a man should by this gather that we make it none other thing but bare bread and naked sign."[5] The words of Christ, "This is my body," are not to be interpreted as "but a sign or figure of His body; except you will discern between signs which signify only, and signs which also do represent, confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) give with their signification. As for example . . . the stone taken out of Juda, Gideon's fleece of wool, and such as these, be signs significative, and show no gift. But in the other signs, which some call exhibitive, is there not only a signification of a thing, but also a declaration of a gift, yea, in a certain manner, a giving thereof. . . . In the Lord's Supper the bread is called 'a partaking of the Lord's body' and not only a bare sign of the body of the Lord. This I speak, not as though . . . Christ's body were in the elements, either were tied to the elements otherwise than sacramentally or spiritually; either that the bread, water and wine may not and must not be called sacramental and external signs; but that they might be discerned from significative and bare signs only, and be taken for signs exhibitive and representative."[1]

---

[1] *Disputations*, p. 21. [2] *Ibid.* p. 22. [3] *Ibid.* p. 37.

[4] *Sermon on the Lord's Supper* (Parker Society), p. 92.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 92.

As in the teaching of Ridley, Bradford establishes grace as the sacramental content exhibited by the sign. "Not that I mean any other presence of Christ's body than a presence by grace, a presence by faith, a presence spiritually, and not corporally, really, naturally, and carnally . . . for in such sort Christ's body is in heaven."[2]

Of all the works written by English Reformers on the Eucharist the most complete are Cranmer's. In 1550 he wrote his *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament*. This having been fully and severely criticised by Gardiner, he wrote in reply his *Answer* (1551), incorporating his former book. Like Ridley, Cranmer was engaged in controversy, a controversy which brought him also to the fire. Like Ridley, therefore, Cranmer makes use of much of the language of his adversaries; and some of his terminology, if wrenched from its context, is the language of medieval realism. Yet he never omits to insert an explanation which emptied the words of their realist content. As Christ "giveth the bread to be eaten with our mouths, so giveth His very body to be eaten with our faith . . . Christ giveth Himself truly to be eaten, chewed and digested; but all is spiritually, with faith not with mouth . . . I say *not* . . . that Christ did not give His body but a figure of His body."[3]

He carefully guards the identification of the consecrated elements with the body and blood of Christ and expressly denies that Christ is present in the elements, "in plain and proper speech it is not true to say that bread is Christ's body or wine His blood. . . . Likewise in plain speech it is not true that we eat Christ's body and drink His blood."[4] His flesh and blood "be not present here with us, but be ascended into heaven."[5] The Papists teach "that Christ is in the bread and wine, but we say . . . that He is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine.[1] . . . He is corporally in heaven only."[2]

---

[1] *Sermon*, p. 93f. Similar teaching on the spiritual presence was given by Latimer and by John Philpot, Fellow of New College, Oxford, who was burned in 1555. *Cf*. Dimock, *Euch. Pres.*, pp. 37 ff., 45 ff. (Editor.)

[2] *Ibid.* 95, *Cf*. p. 96.

[3] *Answer* (Parker Society), p. 151.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 110, [5] *Ibid.* p. 116.

Here, then, is the key to his language. The sacramental presence of Christ is a presence in the believer, not in the elements. Eucharistic feeding imparts spiritual life in the old Greek and Johannine sense. "Christ is in all persons that truly believe in Him, in such sort, that with His flesh and blood He doth spiritually nourish and feed them, and giveth them everlasting life."[3] So he defines the sacramental reality or content as "grace" or "virtue" in the manner characteristic of the English Reformers; "in the due ministration of the Sacraments . . . Christ and His Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, in all them that worthily receive the same. . . . The force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was sacrificed for us and of His blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that do duly receive the Sacrament."[4] The symbolism of sacramental language is not bare. A Sacrament "be no vain or bare token."[5] "I do not say that Christ's body and blood be given to us in signification, not in deed. But I do speak as plainly as I can, that Christ's body and blood be given to us in deed, yet not corporally, and carnally, but spiritually and effectively."[6]

Christ in the Sacrament imparts spiritual grace, virtue, power, and so produces the *effect* of His spiritual presence in the believer. The instruments of the spiritual process are the consecrated elements, which are, however, kept distinct from Christ's presence, which operates within the faithful recipient.[7] For the rest, the language of Scripture and of doctrine is figurative and symbolical. In the words of institution "the bread is a figure or sacrament of Christ's body"[8]—"they might well know that Christ called the bread His body, and the wine His blood for some figure, similitude, and property of the bread and wine unto His flesh and blood."[9] "It being fully proved (that Christ called material bread His body) it must needs follow consequently, that this manner of speaking is a figurative speech."[1] "These speeches . . . be speeches not taken in the proper signification of every word, but by translation of these words 'eating' and 'drinking' from the signification of a corporal thing . . . that signifieth by the name of the thing which is signified thereby."[2] "Marvel not . . . that Christ spake in figures, when He did institute the Sacrament, seeing it is the nature of all sacraments to be figures.[3] . . . But in the Old (Testament) mystery and sacrament the lamb was not the Lord's very passover or passing-by; so likewise in the New Testament the bread and wine be not Christ's very body and blood, but they be figures which by Christ's institution be unto the godly receiver thereof sacraments, tokens, significations, and representations of His very flesh and blood."[4]

---

[1] *Answer*, p. 52. [2] *Ibid.* p. 54. [3] *Ibid.* p. 52.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 3. [5] *Ibid.* p. 11. [6] *Ibid.* p. 37.
[7] *Ibid.* pp. 68, 70, 205. [8] *Ibid.* p. 15. [9] *Ibid.* p. 37.

Much of Jewel's work in the *Apology* is occupied with a discussion of patristic authorities. His own teaching appears in Chapters XII—XIV. "The Eucharistia, the Supper of the Lord, is a Sacrament; that is, to wit, an evident token of the body and blood of Christ."[5] But the symbols or tokens possess content and impart real feeding. "We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that by faith we verily receive His body and His blood."[6] "We mean not to abase the Lord's Supper or to teach that it is but a cold ceremony only, and nothing to be wrought therein. . . . For we affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give His own self in His Sacraments. . . . And we say not, this is done slightly and coldly, but effectually and truly."[7] Again the emphasis is placed rather on the act of feeding than upon an actual presence of Christ, who is present in the believer and not in the elements, and Transubstantiation is excluded by the remark, "Yet say we not this is so, as though we thought that the nature and substance of the bread and wine is clearly changed, and goeth to nothing."[8]

---

[1] *Answer*, p. 110. [2] *Ibid.* p. 110. [3] *Ibid.* p. 135. [4] *Ibid.* p. 136.

[5] *Apology*, xii. 1 (Parker Society), p. 62.

[6] *Ibid.* xiii. 1; p. 63. [7] *Ibid.* xiv. 1; p. 63 f.

[8] *Ibid.* xiii, 1; p. 63.

The subjective condition of the faithful recipient rather than an objective presence of Christ receives the stress in Jewel's interpretation. "For although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by the Spirit. And it is no vain faith which doth comprehend Christ; and that is not received with cold devotion, which is received with understanding, with faith, and with Spirit. For Christ Himself is altogether so offered and given us in these mysteries, that we may certainly know that we 'be flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone,' and that Christ continueth in us and we in Him."[1]

Hooker deals with the "Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" in Book V, Chapter LXVII, of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*. His position is essentially the same as that of his predecessors, except that he is not on his defence against Romanists, and lays stress on points on which all are agreed. But he associates himself with the developed "Reformed" views against the Lutheran and the Roman, holding that both these intrude needless difficulties.

Hooker defends the symbolical interpretation. "Some did exceedingly fear that Zwinglius and Œcolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of the Sacrament but only as of a shadow, destitute, empty and void of Christ."[2] So he defends the "Sacramentaries" and denies that symbolism empties the Eucharist of spiritual content. "They do not so interpret the words of Christ as if the name of His body did impart but the figure of His body, and the wine only to signify His blood. They grant that these holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood which were given for the life of the world, and besides also impart unto us even in true and real though mystical manner the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and entire."[3] If this teaching was really held by the "Sacramentarians" then later estimates of their position will need revision.

Hooker's fundamental sacramental conception is that of participation in and union with Christ rather than the feeding upon Him or receiving Him described in the teaching of Cranmer and Jewel. There is "a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely the real participation of Christ and of life in His body and blood by means of this Sacrament."[1] Commenting on the words, "This is my body," he says: "this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby, as I make Myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand or actual possession of all such saving grace as My sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them My body."[2]

---

[1] *Apology* xiv, 1; p. 64.

[2] *Eccles. Pol.*, V, lxvii. 2 (Bayne, p. 372).

[3] *Ibid. S.* 8 (Bayne, p. 379).

The sacramental presence of Christ is in the believer, not in the elements, which are only the instruments of the presence of the ensuing union of the faithful with Christ. "There remaineth now no controversy saving only about the subject *where* Christ is. Yea, even on this point no soul denieth but that the *soul of man* is the receptacle of Christ's presence." This statement is strengthened by a denial of both Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation. "Nothing rests doubtful but this, whether when the Sacrament is administered Christ be whole within man only, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves," either consubstantiated or transubstantiated.[3] "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth Him."[4]

While the sacramental elements shew forth in an exhibitive manner the spiritual grace, yet Hooker declines to assign to them a real content of grace. At the most they are instruments of the supply of grace, the instrumental source of the same. "As for the Sacraments, they really exhibit, but for ought we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow."[1] "The bread and cup are His body and blood because they are the causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His body and blood ensueth."[2] . . . "These holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood which were given for the life of the world and besides also impart unto us even in true and real though mystical manner the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and entire, as hath been shewed."[3]

---

[1] *S.* 2 (Bayne, p. 372 f., *cf. S.* 5 *ibid.* p. 375 f.).
[2] *S.* 12 (*ibid.* p. 384).
[3] *S.* 2 (*ibid.* p. 373).
[4] *S.* 6 (*ibid.* p. 376).

These English writers have many marked features in common. Not one of them holds a purely so-called "Zwinglian" view—that the Sacrament is a mere memorial, and that the symbol has no reality behind it. Tyndale comes nearest to this position. All reject any local or substantial (corporeal or "real") presence of Christ's body in or with the bread, as well as the Lutheran conception of its ubiquity; the actual body and blood of Christ are in heaven. They agree in denying that the wicked actually receive Christ's body; and in denying the Sacrament to be a propitiatory sacrifice. All hold that the Lord at the Institution used figurative language.

The Puritans shared the same doctrine as the official Church leaders. The doctrine of Calvin, which had the greatest influence with them, differed hardly if at all from that of Bucer, which was shared by Cranmer. Hooker does not in any way distinguish Anglican doctrine as a fourth type from the Roman, Lutheran and "Reformed," but associates it with the last in distinction from the rest. His well-known saying that "the real presence of Christ's body and blood is not to be sought in the Sacrament but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament" has a close parallel in Cranmer; "The papists teach that Christ is in the bread and wine, but we say that He is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine." There is some variety in the statements as to the benefit of the Sacrament, or what is really received thereby. They say constantly that we receive spiritually the body and blood of Christ, or that our souls are thereby strengthened and refreshed, as our bodies by bread and wine. But from time to time they go behind this symbolism. They appear to be agreed upon two interpretations—we are assured of our union with Christ, especially our share in the blessings won by His death; and our union with Him is renewed.

---

[1] *S.* 6 (*Bayne*, p. 376). [2] *S.* 5 (*ibid.* p. 375). [3] *S.* 8 (*ibid.* p. 379).

Some regard the Sacrament rather as "a means whereby we receive the grace," while others value it rather as "a pledge to assure us thereof." Tyndale says we are more fully assured of the promises made in Christ's blood. The Sacrament is not only the memorial but also the earnest and seal of His body and blood. Hooker maintains that the Sacraments confirm the promise of eternal life; and the merits of Christ's precious body in heaven feed the soul, a statement which is heightened by the teaching of Ridley, who says that Christ's body in heaven imparts its own life to us. Cranmer is content with the more general conclusion that Christ gives Himself with all His benefits, teaching which is repeated by Jewel, that Christ gives Himself; we hold Him fast, eat Him by faith, understanding and spirit, and have everlasting life by His cross and blood. To Bradford, the Sacrament is an exhibitive sign—an exhibition and a giving of the grace of Christ's body; we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we receive Christ Himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BARCLAY, A. *The Protestant Doctrine ot the Lord's Supper* (1927)—contains a full bibliography.

CALVIN, J. *Expositio Christianae Fidei* (*cf.* Niemeyer. *Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper* (*Tracts* II., 1849, Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh). *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, Book IV. (A. Tholuck, Berlin, 1834).

DIECKHOFF, A. W. *Die Evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter*(1854).

DIMOCK, N. *Concerning the Eucharistic Presence* (1911). *The Doctrine of the Sacraments* (1908).

EGLI, M. & FINSLER, G. *Huldrich Zwingli's Sämtliche Werke* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1905, in progress).

HOOKER, R. *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. (R. Bayne, 1902).

MACKINNON, J. *Luther and the Reformation* (1925–1930).

MOULE, H. C. G. *Bishop Ridley on the Lord's Supper* (1895).

NIEMEYER, H. A. *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis* (Leipzig, 1840).

PARKER SOCIETY, LONDON. Editions of Bradford, Bullinger, Cranmer, Hooper, Jewel and Ridley.

SCHAFF, P. *A History of the Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols (1877).

SMYTH, C. H. E. *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI.* (1926).

WACE, H. *Cranmer on the Lord's Supper* (1928).

VI. ANTI-ROMAN APOLOGETICS.

THE CAROLINES.

W. H. MACKEAN.

THE study of the Evangelical doctrine of the Holy Communion during the seventeenth century is of special interest and importance, both on account of the contribution made by the divines of that period to Reformed theology, and on account of their reaction from the position held by those responsible for the great doctrinal changes of the preceding century. Further, it was a century of striking and eminent figures, who were distinguished for their intellectual power, wide learning, acute reasoning and deep piety; and their number was such that the century has been described as "the golden age of English theology." It was, however, a time of controversy with the Church of Rome; the literary struggle went on actively during the reigns of James I. and Charles I., and was renewed with greater intensity in the days of James II. Close attention was paid to the doctrine of the Holy Communion; and as has been often the case in the history of the Church, controversy stimulated clearness of thought and definition.

One feature of the period was the frequent use of the term "real presence." In the early days of the Reformation it had been generally associated with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and rejected, unless it was accompanied by an explanation. So Cranmer said: "Not long before I wrote the said *Catechism*, I was in that error of the real presence."[1] On the other hand, Latimer, in expressing his belief in none other than a spiritual presence, added: "The same presence may be called a real presence."[2] But as time went on, the term came into common use, e.g. Perkins, the celebrated Puritan, wrote: "We hold and believe a presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that no feigned, but a true and real presence. . . . Thus far do we consent with the Romish

---

[1] *On the Lord's Supper*, p. 374, ed. 1844.
[2] *Remains*, p. 252, ed. 1845.

Church touching real presence. We differ not touching the presence itself, but only in the manner of presence."[1] Archbishop Laud said: "Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist"[2]; and in 1654 appeared Jeremy Taylor's book, entitled *The real and true Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.* Consequently, when reference was made to the "real presence," it is essential to discover in what sense the author used the phrase. Divines have often been misjudged because of its ambiguity; and Dean Aldrich considered that the Church of England had "wisely forborn to use" such an unsatisfactory term.

Moreover, as "real presence" had once been associated with Roman doctrine, it was displaced by the terms "corporal," "carnal," or "bodily" presence, by which was meant, not necessarily a gross material presence, but the presence of an etherealised body. So Bishop Nicolson, in his exposition of the Catechism, says: "This presence of His is real . . . for He is truly and effectually there present, though not corporally, bodily, carnally, locally."[3] The term "corporal presence" was accepted by the Lutherans as expressing their own doctrine and that of the Roman and Greek Churches.[4]

The question for inquiry is to what extent the writers of this period held the doctrine of Reformed theology on the Holy Communion. To what extent did they maintain the doctrine whereby the Saviour's words: "This is my body," etc., are understood figuratively, so that while the elements remain bread and wine they are symbols of the body and blood of Christ, not bare signs, but effectual signs whereby the body and blood of Christ are made real and effective for those who receive worthily?

It is simpler and more convenient to group the divines of the period according to their general doctrinal standpoint, than to attempt a classification of their eucharistic tenets, especially as Receptionist doctrine has a tendency to pass into Virtualism, and it is difficult in some cases to draw a dividing line between them. The grouping represents the general trend and sympathy of the writers, though naturally each division includes men of varying shades of thought.

---

[1] *Works*, i. 589 f. ed. 1616.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. 328.

[3] P. 179, ed. 1844.

[4] Goode, p. 624.

THE LAUDIAN SCHOOL.

Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626), successively Bishop of Chichester, Ely and Winchester, was the most influential figure in the Church during the early part of the seventeenth century. He was not only a man of eminent piety and the foremost preacher of his time, but was possessed of great learning, which stood him in good stead in his controversies with Cardinal Bellarmine and with Cardinal Perron. The records of these controversies are valuable in elucidating his beliefs. Though he was really the founder of the Laudian school of thought, he was a strong anti-Romanist, even regarding the Pope as anti-Christ and the Roman Church as the Babylon of the Apocalypse;[1] and he wrote of the doctrine of Transubstantiation: "It is perfectly clear that transubstantiation, which has lately been born in the last four hundred years, never existed in the first four hundred."[2] On the other hand, in his answer to Cardinal Perron, he disclaimed the Zwinglian interpretation of the Lord's Supper: "To avoid *est* in the Church of Rome's sense, he fell to be all for *significat*, and nothing for *est* at all. And whatsoever went further than *significat* he took to savour of the carnal presence."[3] He firmly held the doctrine of the presence in the Sacrament, and wrote to Cardinal Bellarmine: "We believe no less than you that the presence is true."[4] But he did not thereby mean the doctrine of the objective real presence in or under the forms of bread and wine. "As to the mode of the presence we define nothing rashly, and I add, we do not anxiously inquire any more than in our Baptism how the blood of Christ washes us." A parallel is drawn between the presence of the blood of Christ in Baptism, and the presence in the Eucharist. "He plainly insinuates," says Archbishop Wake, "that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was much the same as in Baptism."[5] Elsewhere, too, Andrewes made a similar reference: "Now then His blood, after it had by the very pouring it out wrought these two effects, it ran not waste, but divided into two streams, one into 'the laver of the new birth'—our baptism . . . the other into 'the cup of the New Testament in His blood'."[1] There is no suggestion in either quotation that the blood of Christ is more present in the cup than in the font, and if he had meant a presence in the elements he would not have expressed himself in this way.

---

[1] *Responsio*, Ch. 9 f.
[2] *Minor Works*, p. 14
[3] *Ibid.* p. 262.
[4] *Responsio*, p. 13.
[5] Gibson, x. 69.

When Cardinal Perron referred to a real presence under or in the sacramental species, Andrewes replied: "The terms of *sous les espèces* or *dans les espèces sacramentales*, it would pose the Cardinal and all the whole College to find they were ever heard or dreamt of in S. Augustine's time, or many hundred years after."[2]

His attitude to the adoration of the elements was unmistakable. To Cardinal Perron he wrote in the section entitled "The external adoration of the Sacrament": "We . . . hold the Sacrament to be venerable and with all due respect to be handled and received"; but he showed that the patristic quotations given by the Cardinal did not teach adoration of the Sacrament. He then quoted Theodoret's words:[3] "The sacramental symbols, after the consecration, go not from their own nature, but abide in their former substance, shape and kind." . . "The symbols so abiding, it is easily known, no divine adoration can be used to them, nor any other than hath been said."[4]

In the *Responsio*, after objecting to Cardinal Bellarmine's expression "The adoration of the Sacrament," he made the obvious general statement: "Christ Himself, the *res sacramenti*, in and with the Sacrament, out of, or apart from, the Sacrament, wherever He is, is to be adored"; and he proceeded to say:

> "Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, and is truly to be adored, that is the *res sacramenti*, but not the Sacrament, that is 'the earthy part,' as . . . Irenaeus says,[5] 'the visible,' as Augustine says.[6] We also with Ambrose, adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries, not that thing, 'but Him who is worshipped above the altar (*non id, sed Eum qui super altare colitur*) . . . yet we none of us adore the Sacrament. . . . Beyond the design (*finem*) of the

---

[1] *Sermons*, iii. 101 f.

[2] *Minor Works*, p. 14.

[3] *Dial.* ii.

[4] *Minor Works*, pp. 15 ff.

[5] *Adv. Haer.* IV. xviii. 5.

[6] *Sermo*, 105, *cf. Sermo*, 71, 32.

[7] *De Spir. Sanc.* iii. cap. xi. 79.

> Sacrament, beyond the force of the command, no use of it exists. Let that be done, which Christ wished to be done, when he said 'Do this'; let nothing remain which the priest may show out of a pyx, and the people adore."[1]

The real presence indicated the crucified, not the glorified body:[2]

> "*Epulemur* doth here[3] refer to *immolatus*. To Christ, not every way considered, but as when He was offered. Christ's body that now is. True; but not Christ's body as now it is, but as then it was, when it was offered, rent and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not, as now He is, glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*, for He is immortal and impassible. But as then He was when He suffered death, that is passible and mortal. Then, in His passible estate did He institute this of ours, to be a memorial of His *passibile* and *Passio* both. And we are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*sursum corda*). but we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His Eternal Spirit not He alone, but He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If a host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it, thither we must look. To the serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver;* we must *hoc facere*, do that is then done. So, and no otherwise, is this *epulare* to be conceived."[4]

Although this conception represents a contradiction in the phraseology of his criticism of the objective real presence, it was a genuine attempt to dissociate the consecrated elements from the realist notion of the presence, for if the body and blood, as they were on the Cross, are distant in time and place, and literally, as such, are no more, they can only be present by faith, which, disregarding time, takes and feeds on them. Archbishop Wake comments on the passage:

> "Whatsoever real presence then this Bishop believed,

---

[1] *Responsio*, pp. 266 f.

[2] Gore, pp. 181 ff. R. C. Moberly, pp. 322 ff.

[3] 1 Cor. v. 8.

[4] *Sermons*, ii. 301 ff.

it must be of His crucified body, and as in the state of His death; and that I think cannot be otherwise present than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge, either figuratively in the elements, or spiritually in the souls of those who worthily receive them."[1]

The Evangelical character of the doctrine held by Andrewes may also be seen from his description of the effect of consecration, and of the Holy Communion as a commemoration of the sacrifice on the cross. He believed that there is a change of character and use in the elements by consecration: "We grant that the elements are changed (*transmutari*), but we look for the word *substantialis* in vain . . . we do not deny that the element is changed (*mutari*) by the blessing";[2] for, as he said elsewhere, in the Sacrament "are delivered to us the holy symbols."[3] And it would seem from the following passage that he held the Virtualist position: "He that breathed, and He that was breathed, both of them vouchsafe to breathe into those holy mysteries a divine power and virtue, and make them to us the bread of life and the cup of salvation."[4] So he spoke of "the conduit-pipes of His grace . . . to them that partake him aright."[5]

Moreover, English Churchmen "believe that the Eucharist was instituted by the Lord for a commemoration of Himself; yea, of His sacrifice, or (if it is permissible so to speak) for a commemorative sacrifice, and not only for a Sacrament or spiritual food." He apologises for using the expression "commemorative sacrifice," as compared with the more accurate expression "commemoration of His sacrifice"; and he goes on to say that the partaking of the Sacrament by the people cannot be separated from the commemorative sacrifice: "To partake by sharing in the prayers, that indeed is a fresh and novel way of partaking; much more even than the private mass itself. . . . Do you take away from the mass your transubstantiation; and there will not long be any strife with us about the sacrifice. Willingly we allow that a memory of the sacrifice is made there. That your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there (*sacrificari ibi Christum vestrum de pane factum*) we will never allow."[6]

---

[1] Gibson, x. 70.
[2] *Responsio*, pp. 262 f.
[3] *Sermons*, iv. 375 f.
[4] *Ibid.* iii. 283.
[5] *Ibid.* i. 100.
[6] *Responsio*, pp. 250 f.

Andrewes often used in his sermons hyperbolical language which, if taken alone, would be misleading. But there is no doubt that he stood definitely on the Reformed side; and of his best known work *The Manual of Private Devotions*, it may be said, the language might be used unreservedly by an Evangelical.

John Buckeridge (*c.* 1562–1631), at one time Bishop of Rochester, and later Bishop of Ely, had been Laud's tutor at Oxford, and had instilled into him his own doctrinal views. He wrote an elaborate *Discourse Concerning Kneeling at the Communion*, in addition to a sermon preached at Whitehall on the same subject. Reference will also be made to his sermon preached at the funeral of Bishop Andrewes.

In the *Discourse* he makes many quotations from the Fathers, especially from Augustine, "the most doctrinal among the ancient fathers."[1] He entirely repudiates the "new fangle of transubstantiation," which many of the wiser Papists, though they dare not say so, wish had never been decreed[2]; and he criticises it as destroying the nature of a sacrament: "To make a conversion of the substance of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, or to annihilate the substances, the accidents still remaining and hanging in the air, without any subject."[3]

He deprecates questions being raised about the mode of Christ's presence—of "con," "trans," "sub," "cum" or "in."[4] But he quotes Calvin with approval both as to his definition of a sacrament,[5] and as distinguishing between Transubstantiation and the real presence,[6] and as teaching that the body and blood of Christ are present in no gross or corporal manner, but in a spiritual manner above our understanding.[7]

He explains the effect of consecration in the following illuminating passage: "We hold them, after they are blessed by the words of Christ, to be reverend and sacred mysteries, so consecrated for use, not for adoration; to convey the flesh and blood of Christ to the believing soul, not to the carnal teeth or belly. We remember the words of our

---

[1] *Responsio*, p. 66.
[2] P. 172 f.
[3] P. 36.
[4] P. 35.
[5] P. 42.
[6] P. 172.
[7] P. 100 f.

Master . . . and we wonder and admire the order: first, *accipite* and *comedite*, take and eat, and then, *hoc est corpus meum*, this is My body and blood."[1]

That he followed the Reformers is indicated by two further points. The Holy Communion is not a "proper" sacrifice, as our adversaries would make it, but "a commemoration" of the sacrifice on the cross.[2] But there is, of course, the sacrifice of our souls and bodies, which he describes as the body of Christ, for "the body of Christ" that is offered in the Eucharist is "Christ's mystical body, the Church, that is, ourselves."[3] He utterly condemns any adoration of the elements: "We are so far from worshipping or adoring the bread and wine after consecration, as the Church of Rome doth, that we hold it to be no better than artolatry and idolatry"[4]; and that is so, whether the adoration be "per se" or "propter se."[5] Such adoration was unknown to the primitive church,[6] and it is to be classed with irreverence, as "not discerning the Lord's body."[7]

Christopher Sutton (*c.* 1565–1629), Prebendary of Westminster, wrote a devotional book *Godly Meditations upon the most Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, which was constantly reprinted during the seventeenth century. Little, however, is known of the author.

He earnestly protests against needless disputes concerning the Holy Communion, and commends the mean between Transubstantiation and the theory that it is merely a badge of our profession and a remembrance of something passed. He held that our Lord's words were figurative: "Let the devout Christian call to mind that He that said of the wine 'This is My blood,' and of the bread 'This is My body,' said also of S. John the Baptist 'This is that Elias,' and of Himself, 'I am the door,' 'the true vine'"; and in a later section he wrote, "But Christ, some say, in express words calleth the bread His body, and the wine His blood; true, in express words also He calleth Himself a rock."

Of Transubstantiation, "that uncertain dream," he says:

> "To take a survey of the beginning and progress of the doctrine of transubstantiation . . . one Berengarius in the year 1028[8] was the first that came upon the stage

---

[1] P. 36. [2] Pp. 51 f. [3] Andrewes, *Sermons*, v. 266. [4] P. 33. [5] P. 37. [6] P. 35. [7] P. 115. [8] The date should be 1048.

> to act this tragedy, by him were kindled such sparks as after brake out into great and fearful flames . . . those sparks kindled by Berengarius began to increase, and set all, as it were, into a most hideous combustion. . . . The Council of Lateran . . . promulgates a new and unheard of doctrine of transubstantiation."

Writing of S. Paul, he said, "Now what saith the Apostle? He commands no adoration; he speaks not a word of Transubstantiation." The fathers likewise know nothing of the doctrine: "Antiquity, therefore, is silent in the plea or the defence of Transubstantiation." The only change the fathers admitted in the elements was of the use: "They admit of a change, but what a one? Of the substance? Nothing less, for it remains the same. Of the use? It is right; for sure in the Lord's Supper it is heavenly and divine."

It may be that in his view there is virtue imparted to the elements themselves, for he says, "by the power of divine benediction, they do receive a virtue, that being received of the faithful, they become nourishment of the soul."[1]

In view then of the figurative interpretation of "This is my body," held by Sutton, the following words in a meditation for devotional use must be interpreted in an Evangelical sense: "Consider the divine wisdom of the Son of God, who, respecting our weakness, hath conveyed unto us His body and blood after a divine and spiritual manner, under the forms of bread and wine."[2] This expression "under the forms of bread and wine" was associated with Romanist doctrine, but there are isolated instances, in which it was used in another sense, by those who held strongly Reformed doctrine, e.g. Fox, etc.[3] And anyhow "conveyed" is quite different from "being" or "present" under the forms of bread and wine.

With the general conclusion on Sutton's doctrinal position Dr. Darwell Stone agrees, for he says: "He appears to have believed that there is no change in the elements at consecration except in regard to their use, but that those who receive them faithfully partake spiritually of the body and blood of Christ in a manner which passes human explanation and understanding."[4]

---

[1] lxix.

[2] iv. 3.

[3] See Dimock, *Euch. Pres.*, pp. 147 ff.

[4] ii. 290.

William Laud (1573–1645), after holding in turn the sees of S. David's, Bath and Wells, and London, became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. His teaching on the Holy Communion is contained in his famous Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, an account of which he published in 1639; and in his last Will, dated 1644, he directed that it should "be translated into Latin and sent abroad, that the Christian world may see and judge of my religion."[1] Further references are to be found in the *History of the Troubles and the Trial* written by himself.

In his criticism of Roman and other theories he regarded the doctrinal differences between the Church of England and Rome as "many and great"[2]; "That there are errors in doctrine, and some of them such as most manifestly endanger salvation, in the Church of Rome, is evident to them that will not shut their eyes"[3]; and he described the Roman faith as "tainted with so many superstitions."[4] Transubstantiation "was never heard of in the primitive Church, nor till the Council of Lateran, nor can it be proved out of Scripture; and taken properly cannot stand with the grounds of the Christian religion."[5] It is "that doctrinal corruption which hath invaded the great Sacrament of the Eucharist,"[6] which "none but modern and superstitious Christians believe"[7]; and the doctrine of concomitance is but "the fiction of Thomas of Aquin."[8]

Laud also referred to the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation as another unwarrantable attempt to explain the manner of the presence. "All sides agree in the faith of the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament the worthy receiver is, by his faith, made spiritually partaker of the 'true and real body and blood of Christ truly and really' and of all the benefits of His passion. Your Roman Catholics add a manner of this His presence, transubstantiation, which many deny; and the Lutherans a manner of this presence, consubstantiation, which more deny. If this argument be good, then even for this consent, it is safer communicating with the Church of England than with the Roman or Lutheran; because all agree in this truth, not in any other opinion."[1] He had, however, no sympathy with "the Zuinglian tenet, that the Sacrament is a bare sign taken in remembrance of Christ's passion."[2]

---

[1] *Works*, iv. 449. [2] iv. 230. [3] ii. 166.
[4] ii. 332. [5] ii. 306. But *cf. supra* Chapters II–III.
[6] ii. 152. [7] ii. 329. [8] ii. 338.

For the rest, Laud adhered to the doctrine of the real presence, although he distinguished between a "corporal" and spiritually "real" presence;[3] and he condemned the adoration of the elements.[4]

Richard Mountague (1577–1641), who helped Sir H. Saville to produce the great Eton edition of Chrysostom's works, was successively Bishop of Chichester and Norwich. He was the author of two controversial books, which contain references to the Holy Communion. *A gagg for the New Gospell? No, a new gagg for an old goose* (1624), and *Appello Caesarem* (1625).

The "unexplicable labyrinths of consubstantiation and transubstantiation" only serve to introduce division, but as he condemned "the presumptuous definition of transubstantiation in the Lateran Council," a doctrine which he described as that "monster of monsters," and as contradicting our Lord's teaching in S. John vi., so he neither liked nor assented to "that jejeune and macilent conceit" of Zwingli and Œcolampadius, whereby the Sacrament is reduced to "a bare shadow, empty and void, and destitute of Christ."[5] The latter view, however, is not that of Protestants, and he claimed that Bishop Bilson and Bishop Morton, like Protestants in general, believed in a real presence. He then quoted Calvin's teaching that "the presence of Christ's body, in respect of the souls of the faithful, is truly in this Sacrament and substantially received," and stated that this is the doctrine of the Church of England. The controversy is concerning the mode of the presence.

He would have thought that everyone agreed concerning a change of the bread and wine, that it was "something more than mere ordinary bread and wine," as the Fathers had taught. But change, transmutation or transelementation do not imply Transubstantiation. It is "a sacramental conversion, that is of signification and of operation and use," as is the case with the water of Baptism. The bread and wine are "changed in use to be instruments by faith of grace."

---

[1] *Works*, ii. 320 f.
[2] iii. 357. But *cf. supra*, p. 169.
[3] ii. 328 f., iii. 354 f., 357.
[4] ii. 417; iii. 326, 348.
[5] *New Gagg*, p. 12 (Pref.), pp. 252 ff.

It is true that some of the Fathers used hyperbolical speech in their popular sermons, in particular Chrysostom, some of whose statements cannot be understood literally, as for example when he spoke of the congregation "being reddened with that most precious blood." He acknowledged that he himself may have "taken licence in use of terms," but he held no error in doctrine. It is not Popery to speak of the "Sacrament of the altar" if "altar" be rightly understood. He, however, believed in "no such sacrifice of the altar as the Church of Rome doth," nor "such altars as they employ"; it is indeed not a proper sacrifice, "but only representative, rememorative and spiritual."[1] To Mountague, the bread and wine undergo a change similar to that of the water in Baptism; and he was in entire sympathy with the Reformed teaching on the Eucharist.

Thomas Jackson (1579–1640), President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Dean of Peterborough, was one of the great divines of his time. He was a strong anti-Romanist, and rigorously opposed the doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation:

> "The modern Lutheran and the modern Romanist have fallen into their several errors concerning Christ's presence in the Sacrament, from a common ignorance; neither of them conceive, nor are they willing to conceive, how Christ's body and blood shall have any real operation upon our souls, unless they were so locally present, as they might *agere per contactum*, that is, either so purge our souls by oral manducation as physical medicines do our bodies (which is the pretended use of transubstantiation), or so quicken our souls, as sweet odours do the animal spirits, which were the most probable use of the Lutheran consubstantiation. . . . As for ubiquity and transubstantiation, they are the two monsters of modern times, brought forth by ignorance, and maintained only by faction."[2]

---

[1] *Appello Caesarem*, pp. 261 f., 285 ff., *New Gagg*, pp. 255 ff.

[2] *Works*, ix. 598 f.

He rejected that "late invention," the doctrine of concomitance,[1] and referred to "the gross absurdities and scandalous inconveniences which necessarily follow upon their doctrine of transubstantiation, or of Christ's local circumscriptive bodily presence in the blessed Sacrament."[2] Romish priests have had to adopt various shifts to maintain this doctrine, "some of them seek to maintain Christ's local presence, or transubstantiation, by the former doctrine of God's Almighty power, which is able to create one and the same body often: others seek to maintain the same doctrine, and carry away the prey by the manner of angelical motion from one place to another in an instant or moment of time."[3]

But occasionally he expressed himself in a peculiar way, nor was he always guarded in his language, which might be misunderstood and be regarded as contrary to Evangelical doctrine. Dr. Darwell Stone has, however, summed up his true attitude: "The references to Eucharistic doctrine in it appear to give expression to a belief that the Elements are not changed at consecration, but that by rightly partaking of them communicants spiritually receive the body and blood of Christ and the benefits of His sacrifice."[4]

Jackson defines the real presence as follows:

> "When we say that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, our meaning is, that as God He is present in an extraordinary manner, after such a manner as He was present (before His incarnation) in His sanctuary, the ark of His Covenant; and by the power of His Godhead, thus extraordinarily present, He diffuseth the virtue or operation of His human nature, either to the vivification or hardening of their hearts who receive the sacramental pledges."[5]

The real presence, then, is the presence of Christ's Godhead diffusing the virtue or operation of His human nature,[6] and he expressed it elsewhere as the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit:

> "We may consecrate the elements of bread and wine, and administer them so consecrated as undoubted pledges of His body and blood . . . yet unless He grant some

---

[1] *Works*, x. 55 f. [2] x. 254. [3] x. 258. [4] ii. 294.
[5] x. 52 f. [6] *Cf. supra*, p. 104.

> actual influence of His spirit, and suffer such virtue to go out from His human nature now placed in His sanctuary . . . we do not really receive His body and blood with the elements of bread and wine."[1]

The doctrine of the presence, taught by the Church of England, he says, is that of "a spiritual influence or a virtual presence," for, referring to the Lutherans, he stated "if they will call that a body which we would call a spiritual influence or a virtual presence (so we may know what they really mean by this word body), let them enjoy their dialect."[2]

That he held no doctrine of an "objective real presence" is supported by other sayings; and Virtualism is a pronounced feature of his teaching:

> "He becomes the propitiation for our sins, He actually remits our sins, not directly and immediately by the elements of bread and wine, nor by any other kind of local presence or compresence with those elements than is in baptism. The orthodoxal ancients use the same language for expressing His presence in baptism and in the Eucharist."[3] . . . "Christ's body and blood are so present in the Sacrament, that we receive a more special influence from them in use of the Sacrament than without it we do."[4]

He distinguished a local or bodily presence from a virtual presence:

> "With whomsoever He is virtually present, that is, to whomsoever He communicates the influence of His body and blood by His Spirit He is really present with them, though locally absent from them. . . . What need then is there of His bodily presence in the Sacrament, or of any other presence than the influence or emission of virtue from His heavenly sanctuary into our souls?"[5] "This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature, is that which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real presence, or of eating His very flesh, and drinking His very blood in the Sacrament. And the sacramental bread is called His body, and the sacramental wine His blood, as for other reasons, so

---

[1] *Works*, ix. 610. [2] x. 27. [3] ix. 595. [4] x. 63. [5] ix. 610 f.

especially for this, that the virtue or influence of His bloody sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from heaven unto the worthy receivers of the Eucharist."[1]

Jackson was unsparing in his denunciation of the adoration of the consecrated host[2], and he says we must grant "that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, as well to the unworthy as to the faithful receivers." This follows from his own definition of the real presence; yet it was not because the real body and blood are in or under the forms of the elements, so that in taking the one, the communicant necessarily receives the other. But when the unworthy communicant receives the sacramental pledges, the Holy Spirit gives him the virtue of the body and blood to the hardening of his heart; as the sun "is really present to clay and to wax—it really hardeneth the one, and really softeneth the other. So doth Christ's body and blood by its invisible but real influence, mollify the hearts of such as come to the Sacrament with due preparation, but harden such as unworthily receive the consecrated elements."[3]

George Herbert (1595–1633), was the poet of the Laudian School of Thought. In his treatise, *A Priest to the Temple, or the Country Parson, his Character and Rule of Holy Life*, as well as in his poems, he alludes to the Holy Communion, and expresses himself in symbolical language. In the former work, the country parson, especially at Communion times, "is in a great confusion as being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him."[4] And in his poems entitled *The Temple*, he says: "God vouchsafeth to become our fare"; "their (the priests) hands convey Him";[5] and "God is here prepared and drest, and the feast God."[6] It is sufficient by way of comment to say with Dean Goode,[7] "either this language is highly figurative and symbolical, or it is blasphemous."

Henry Hammond (1605–1660), Archdeacon of Chichester and Canon of Christ Church, was a notable Biblical scholar and linguist. His most popular work was *A Practical Catechism* (1644), which must have had a wide influence, for by the year 1847 it had passed through sixteen editions.

---

[1] *Works*, x. 41.
[2] ii. 208 ff.
[3] x. 52.
[4] Ch. 22.
[5] "The Priesthood."
[6] "The Invitation."
[7] P. 883.

In it he said, "Not that the bread was His body, and the wine His blood, in strict speaking, for He was then in His body when He so spake . . . and now His body is in heaven . . . and is not corporally brought down in every Sacrament, either to be joined locally with the elements, or for the elements to be changed into it; many contradictions and barbarisms would be consequent to such an interpretation."[1]

In commenting on "This is my body," he suggests that the word "this" does not refer to the bread, but to the whole eucharistic action: "This breaking, taking, eating of the bread, this whole action is . . . the very giving Christ's body to me; that as verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in heaven bestows on me, communicates to me the body of the crucified Saviour."[2] From these passages it is clear that the "res sacramenti" is received not from the hands of the minister, but from God; the body of Christ is not in the elements; the heavenly gift is the body of the crucified Saviour.

These conclusions are supported by other sayings:

> "The faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, which implies not any corporal presence of Christ on the table, or in the elements, but God's communicating the crucified Saviour, who is in heaven bodily, and nowhere else, to us sinners on the earth, but this mystically, and after an ineffable manner."[3] "As truly as the bishop or presbyter gives me the sacramental bread and wine, so truly doth God in heaven bestow upon me on earth the body and blood of Christ, i.e. the crucified Saviour, not by local motion, but by real communication; not to our teeth, but to our souls.'"[4] "Bestowing that body and blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it: as when the sun is communicated to us, the whole bulk and body of the sun is not removed out of its sphere, but the rays and beams of it, and with them the light and warmth and influences are really and verily bestowed or darted out upon us; and all this is the full importance of 'This is My body' or 'This is the communication of His body.'"[5]

---

[1] P. 382. [2] P. 394. [3] P. 385. [4] P. 396. [5] P. 395.

Hammond's belief, then, was that the bread and wine are not, strictly speaking, the body and blood of Christ. There is no corporal presence on the table or in the elements. But the body of the crucified Saviour is communicated to the souls of the faithful in the whole eucharistic action.

John Bramhall (1594–1663), after spending the early years of his ministry in Yorkshire, crossed to Ireland in 1633. Soon afterwards he was consecrated Bishop of Derry. He was, however, for long an exile on the Continent; but in 1661 he became Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland. He was a great champion of the Church of England and one of the ablest divines of the period. The following works, written between the years 1645 and 1658, contain references to the doctrine of the Holy Communion: *An Answer to M. de la Milletière*; *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*; *Consecration of Protestant Bishops vindicated*; and *An Answer to two papers*.

"No genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny," he says, "a true real presence"; to do otherwise would be to contradict the words of Christ, "This is my body."[1] But the manner "can neither be perceived by sense nor by imagination"; consequently, "the presumption to anatomise mysteries" is the more inexcusable. "We rest in the words of Christ, 'This is My body,' leaving the manner to Him that made the Sacrament. We know it is sacramental and therefore efficacious, because God was never wanting to His own ordinances."[2] As it is "the Sacrament of peace and unity," it "ought not to be made the matter of strife and contention"; and Bramhall deplores the fact that whereas there was no controversy on the subject for eight hundred years, questions have since been raised as to the manner of the presence with disastrous results.[3]

Moreover, when the Fathers used such expressions as "seeing Christ," and "touching Christ" in the Sacrament, and "making our tongues red in His blood," he says that they "never meant by these forms of speech to determine the manner of the presence (which was not dreamt of in their days), but to raise the devotion of their hearers and readers: to advertise the people of God, that they should not rest in the external symbols or signs, but principally be intent upon the invisible grace."[1]

---

[1] i. 8; ii. 211. [2] i. 22. [3] i. 8 ff.

As regards Transubstantiation, "the fathers did not touch either the word or the matter. . . . Mark it well, neither name nor thing."[2] Indeed, to find it mentioned in any old author would be sufficient to prove him a counterfeit. "We have rejected it deservedly from being an article of our Creed."[3] Bramhall did not use the severe language of many writers, though he referred on several occasions[4] to the resulting peril of idolatry. But such are the implications of the doctrine that he can say with Bishop Andrewes to the Romanists: "Take away your transubstantiation, and we shall have no difference about the sacrifice";[5] for in defending Protestant ordinations he had previously said that their form gives sufficient power to consecrate "and also to sacrifice."[6] Further, Bramhall stated that the Church of England did not include in its articles of faith a belief as to whether the presence is in the soul, or in or under the elements. Of the Lord's words "This is my body," he remarked "He said not, after this or that manner, *neque con, neque sub, neque trans*. And, therefore, we place it (Transubstantiation) among the opinions of the schools, not among the articles of our faith."[7] He also said, "Whether it be in the soul only, or in the host also; and if in the host, whether by consubstantiation or transubstantiation; whether by production, or adduction, or conservation, or assumption, or by whatsoever other way bold and blind men dare conjecture, we determine not":[8] and, as Dimock pointed out,[9] the context shows that "determine" here means "set up as an article of faith," a common use of the word among English divines.[10] He also denied that "our predecessors" were Zwinglian in their doctrine.[11]

It is not easy to decide what were Bramhall's own views, for he was content "to rest in the words of Christ." But there are several indications that he was in accord with reformed doctrine. The bread and wine were "symbols,"[12] and "the instruments ordained by our Saviour to convey to us the merits of His Passion."[13] Whether the consecration be after the manner of the Western or Eastern Church, he says: "They who are ordained priests ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, that is to make them present after such manner as they were present at the first institution."[1] Bramhall takes us back to the original occasion when our Lord was sitting at the table. Obviously, He was not present in the elements according to His human nature; He gave them symbols of His body and blood; so it is now. Besides referring to the adoration of the Sacrament as an abuse,[2] and as the reason for the institution of the festival of Corpus Christi, he said: "We dare not give divine worship unto any creature, not to the very humanity of Christ in the abstract (much less to the host), but to the whole person of Christ, God and Man . . . Show us such an union betwixt the Deity and the elements, or accidents, and you say something. . . . There is no more adoration due to the Sacrament than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth. Exact no more."[3] Later he continued, regarding the supposition that the species of bread and wine contain Christ, "Why do they not add upon the same grounds that the pyx is to be adored with divine worship because it contains the Sacrament?" And previously he had said of distinctions in language regarding the kind of honour due to the elements: "Whilst your common people understand not these distinctions of degrees of honour, what holds them from falling downright into idolatry?"[4]

---

[1] i. 13 f.
[2] i. 24.
[3] i. 55.
[4] E.g. I. 44 f.; ii. 86 f.
[5] v. 217.
[6] v. 188.
[7] i. 8.
[8] i. 22.
[9] *Fulham Conference*, p. 92.
[10] E.g. Laud's *Works*, ii. 41, 241.
[11] iii. 168.
[12] i. 14.
[13] i. 20.

John Cosin (1594–1672) was a distinguished member of the Laudian school in the north of England, and was mainly associated with Durham, for many years as Prebendary, and from 1660 as its Bishop. In the Civil War he went into exile, and was with the Royal Family until the Restoration. During that period he wrote his learned *History of Papal Transubstantiation*, which was published after his death. He was a prominent member of the committee of the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661. In Vol. V. of his works there are three series of "Notes on the Book of Common Prayer," but the first series is wrongly ascribed to him by the editor.[5]

---

[1] *Works*, iii. 165. [2] ii. 35 ff. [3] i. 21. [4] i. 45.

[5] Darwell Stone, ii. p. 327. Tomlinson, pp. 171 ff. Correspondence in *Guardian*, Sept. 26 to Oct. 24, 1900.

In his *History of Papal Transubstantiation* Cosin deals with the patristic evidence and shows from the statements of the early Fathers and of later writers that "the cancer of transubstantiation" did not begin to spread over the church in a thousand years after Christ;[1] it was "invented about the middle of the twelfth century out of some misunderstood sayings of the fathers . . . and liable to very bad consequences,"[2] and he wrote elsewhere, "Neither the word of transubstantiation, nor the thing intended by it, was ever heard of in the ancient fathers,"[3] and this "fiction" is rejected by the Church of England.[4]

He devotes considerable space to patristic statements, and says of the Fathers: "They understood that exactly such a change takes place here as is common to all sacraments, by which the external symbols are said to be turned into the divine things themselves, for no other reason than because they truly and efficaciously represent the latter, and the faithful are truly made partakers of them, while they receive the former by the mouth."[5] This, he said, had been the doctrine of the Church for over a thousand years;[6] but attempts had been made to show that the Fathers held the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Cosin groups his reply under five heads, and in so doing shows that in reading the Fathers care is needed, for otherwise some of their statements would be open to misunderstanding.

Some call the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ:

> "But those fathers explain themselves in many places, and interpret those their expressions in such a manner that they must be understood in a mystic and spiritual sense, in that sacraments usually take the names of those things they represent, because of that resemblance which they have with them, 'not by the reality of the thing, but by the signification of the mystery,' as we have shown before out of S. Austin and others. For nobody can deny but that the things that are seen are figures and symbols, and those that are not seen, the body and blood of Christ."[7]

---

[1] *Works*, iv. 113.

[2] iv. 137; but cf. *supra*, p. 115.

[3] iv. 284. ("Concerning the Ordination of priests.")

[4] iv. 347. (*Regni Angl. rel. Cath.*)

[5] iv. 95.

[6] iv. 95.

[7] iv. 98.

He deals next with the statements of Jerome,[1] Ambrose,[2] and others, that "the priests make the body of Christ with the sacred words of their mouth." To this Cosin replied: "At the prayers and blessings of the priests the common bread is made sacramental bread, which when broken and eaten is the communion of the body of Christ, and, therefore, may well be called so sacramentally. For the bread (as I have often said before) doth not only represent the body of Our Lord, but also being received, we are truly made partakers of that body."[3]

He describes the change of the bread and wine as "a change (*mutatio*) of state or condition." The Fathers spoke of it sometimes as conversion, transmutation, transfiguration and transelementation, but they also used such terms in other connections, to express the repentance of sinners, the power of Baptism, the excellency of charity, and the alteration for the better, the greatness, usefulness, power and dignity of many things, etc. This kind of expression was common to Greek and Latin Fathers[4]: "The same holy fathers, who (as the manner is to discourse of sacraments) speak sometimes of the bread and wine of the Holy Eucharist as if they were the very body and blood of the Lord, very often call the same Eucharistic bread and wine types, symbols, signs the figure of the body and blood of Christ."[5]

Coming to his own day, and discussing the doctrine of the real presence, Cosin asserted, "none of the Protestant Churches doubt of the real (that is, the true, and not imaginary) presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist,"[6] and he proceeded to give evidence in support of his statement from the Church of England, the German, French and Swiss Reformed Churches. He looked back with special approval to the teaching of Calvin, of whom he said: "His words in the *Institutions* and elsewhere are such, and so comfortable to the style and mind of the ancient fathers, that no reformed Catholic would wish to use any other."[7]

In his various writings he brought out very carefully and lucidly the meaning which he attached to the spiritual presence. With regard to the institution,

---

[1] *Ep. ad Heliod.* 8: *Ep. ad Evang.*
[2] *De Myst.*, cap. 9.
[3] iv. 98 f.
[4] iv. 99 ff.
[5] iv. 105.
[6] iv. 18.
[7] iv. 41.

> "suppose," said he, "a testator were to deliver from his hand into the hands of his heir title deeds or documents with these words added, 'Receive the house which I leave to you,' no one would suppose that that legal document of paper was the very house made of wood or stone, nor yet would anyone on that account think that the testator had spoken obscurely or falsely. Clearly in the same manner Christ delivered to His disciples the sacred symbols, sanctified by His words and prayers, like seals attached to the documents of the New Testament."[1]
> He utterly denied that "Christ gives us His body and blood to be taken and eaten with the mouth and teeth:"[2]
>
> "For certain it is, that the bread is not the body of Christ any otherwise than as the cup is the New Testament, and that different consequences cannot be drawn from the two expressions. Therefore, as the cup cannot be the New Testament, but by a sacramental figure, no more can the bread be the body of Christ, but in the same sense."[3]

He agreed that there is a change in the condition, use, office of the bread and wine, for Protestants:

> "know and acknowledge that in the Eucharist by virtue of the words and blessing of Christ the bread is wholly changed in condition, use and office; that is, of ordinary and common, it becomes our mystical and sacramental food; whereby they all assert and firmly believe that the true body of Christ itself is not only signified or represented in a figure but also given indeed and received in the souls of those who communicate worthily."[4] . . . "since the thing signified is offered and given to us as truly as the signs themselves, in this way we recognise the union of the signs with the body and blood of the Lord, and we say that the elements are changed into a different use from that which they had before."[5]

Even the phrase, "changed in nature," is admissible by Protestants, if it be understood aright, not "in a strict sense" but "at large, as nature is taken for use or condition."[6]

He makes several negative statements regarding the manner of the presence. Not only after the manner of

---

[1] *De Myst.*, iv. 58. [2] iv. 49. [3] iv. 57 f. [4] iv. 46.
[5] iv. 48 f. [6] iv. 107 f.

Transubstantiation, but "after any other manner whether in, or with, or under the bread, we are not tied to believe at all."[1] He rejects the notion of a "spiritual presence" as meaning a presence of the body of Christ "after the manner of the existence of spirits," and says, "all this and much more to the same effect was never delivered to us by either the Holy Scriptures or the ancient fathers."[2] The presence is not dependent upon our faith. "Yet our faith does not cause or make that presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the word of Christ";[3] although Christ is present only to the faithful communicants in the reception of the bread and wine. "We deny that the Sacrament outside the use appointed by God has the nature of a Sacrament so as to make it right or possible for Christ to be reserved or carried about, since He is present only to those who communicate."[4]

"Of the bread . . . to those indeed, who believe, it becomes the life-giving body, because they are truly partakers of the living bread and body of Christ. But to others, as well those who do not receive as those who do not believe, although it may be an antitype, yet it in no wise is or becomes the body of Christ."[5] It is Christ's body, as "it was crucified and given for the life of the world."[6] There is a sacramental union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, so that "in eating the blessed bread, the true body of Christ is given to us"; and, he adds, that "they are united in time though not in place."[7] . . . "True it is that the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present, when the blessed bread and wine are taken by the faithful communicants; and as true is it also, that they are not present, but only when the hallowed elements are so taken."[8] He denies that the adoration of the elements is permissible.[9]

Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667) in early life was a protégé of Archbishop Laud; and owing to his attachment to the royalist cause he was constantly in trouble, but for many years found a quiet retreat in Wales, where much of his literary work was done. In 1661 he became Bishop of

---

[1] *De Myst.*, iv. 283 ("Concerning the Ordination of priests"). [2] iv. 43 f.
[3] iv. 45. [4] iv. 49. [5] iv. 66. [6] iv. 18. [7] iv. 48.
[8] v. 345 (Notes on B.C.P., 2nd series). [9] *Ibid.*

Down and Connor, and spent the few remaining years of his life in Ireland. The two works which particularly concern us are *The Real Presence*, written in 1654, and the *Dissuasive from Popery* (in two parts, 1664 and 1667), which he undertook at the request of his fellow bishops in Ireland. S. T. Coleridge described *The Real Presence* as "perhaps the most wonderful of all Taylor's books. He seems, if I may say so, to have transubstantiated his vast imagination and fancy into subtilty not to be evaded, acuteness to which nothing remains unpiercable and indefatigable agility of argumentation. Add to these an exhaustive erudition, and that all these are employed in the service of reason and common sense."[1]

His main purpose was to prove that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is unscriptural, against sense and reason, and contrary to the doctrine of the primitive church. It is "an evil doctrine, false and dangerous."[2]

No English divine has given us a fuller and clearer account of his beliefs; and it is of historical importance to note that he claimed to speak not only for himself, but for the Church of England:

> "The doctrine of the Church of England and generally of Protestants in this article, is that after the minister of the holy mysteries hath ritely prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual, real manner: so that all that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of His passion: the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbols only. . . . It is here as in the other Sacrament; for as there natural water becomes the laver of regeneration, so here bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ."[3]

He is careful on succeeding pages to draw attention to the ambiguity of terms used concerning the presence. Of the word "real," quoting the Church Catechism, he says, "'verily and indeed' is *reipsa*, that's really enough. That's our sense of the 'real presence.'"[4] Indeed, "real" is a word "which the English Papists much use, but (as appears) with less reason than the sons of the Church of England: and when the 'real presence' is denied, the word real is taken for natural and does not signify *transcendenter* or in its just and most proper signification."[1]

---

[1] *Notes on English Divines*, i. 280.
[2] *Works*, vi. 9. [3] vi. 13 f. [4] vi. 14.

"A spiritual presence" he describes in the famous words: "By 'spiritually,' they (the Romanists) mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by 'spiritually' we mean 'present to our spirits only'; that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception."[2] This contrast has been regarded as little better than a quibble. But Dimock[3] pointed out the importance of the distinction, for it is intimately connected with "the question, 'What is the true *res sacramenti* in the Eucharist?' Is it the body of Christ as now living and glorified in heaven? Or is it the body of Christ as offered in sacrifice for our sins?" as was held by Bishop Andrewes and many others. Then concerning the "real spiritual presence" he continues: "We (sons of the Church of England) by the 'real spiritual presence' of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence."[4]

Later on, he dealt with the expression "sacramentally present." It was alleged that "Christ's body is sacramentally in more places than one"; which, says Taylor, "is very true, that is, the sacrament of Christ's body is; and so is His body figuratively, tropically, representatively in being, and really in effect and blessing."[5]

He is ready to allow the presence to be described according to the article of Trent as "in substance but after a sacramental manner," if the words "might be understood in the sense in which Protestants use them, that is, 'really,' 'truly,' without fiction or the help of fancy, but in *rei veritate*."[6]

Even the word "corporaliter," which Melanchthon had used at one time, "may become warrantable and consonant to our doctrine, and means no more than 'really and without fiction,' or 'beyond a figure' . . . and thus we affirm Christ's body to be present in the sacrament not only in type or figure, but in blessing and real effect." He went on to say that the word is also admissible when by it is only understood a corporal or material sign.[1]

---

[1] *Works*, vi. 16.
[2] vi. 17.
[3] *Fulham Conference*, p. 9.
[4] vi. 17.
[5] vi. 109.
[6] vi. 16.

With regard to the expression, "a non-local presence" in or under the forms of bread and wine, Taylor says: "I wish the words were sense and that I could tell the meaning of being in a place locally and not locally . . . but so long as it is a distinction, it is no matter, it will amuse and make way to escape, if it will do nothing else."[2]

In showing that Transubstantiation is unscriptural, he reminded his readers that this had been admitted by celebrated Romanist writers themselves. He then proceeded with a critical examination of S. John vi. and the words of institution. He did not believe that S. John vi. referred primarily to the Sacrament, and showed that in the words of institution there is no agreement between East and West as to when the consecration is effected, and even the words themselves vary in the different accounts. "By what argument can it be proved that these words 'Take and eat' are not as effective of the change as *Hoc est corpus meum* 'This is my body'? If they be, then the taking and eating does consecrate: and it is not Christ's body till it be taken and eaten, and then when that's done, it is so no more; and besides that reservation, circumgestation, adoration, elevation of it must of themselves fall to the ground: it will also follow that it is Christ's body only in a mystical, spiritual and sacramental manner."[3] So he adds a little later: "'Take eat' and 'this do' are as necessary to the Sacrament as *Hoc est corpus*, and declare that it is Christ's body only in the use and administration . . . it is Christ's body only in the taking and eating, which is the thing we contend for."[4] He went on to show that the words *Hoc est corpus meum* should be interpreted in a figurative and symbolical way,[5] and that only so can the Upper Room be explained,[6] and that the wicked, according to the doctrine of the ancient Church, do not eat the body nor drink the blood of Christ.[7] He disapproved the practice of adoration and worship of the consecrated elements.[8] Again, "We may not render divine worship to Him as present in the blessed Sacrament according to His human nature without danger of idolatry; because He is not there according to His human nature, and therefore you give divine worship to a *non ens*, which must needs be idolatry. For *idolum nihil est in mundo*, saith S. Paul; and Christ's presence by His human nature in the Sacrament is a *non ens;* for it is not true: there is no such thing. He is present there by His divine power, and His divine blessing, and the fruits of His body, the real effective consequents of His Passion; but for any other presence it is *idolum*, it is nothing in the world. Adore Christ in heaven, for the heavens must contain Him till the time of restitution of all things."[1]

---

[1] vi. 17 f.
[2] vi. 111.
[3] vi. 41.
[4] vi. 44 f.
[5] vi. 59 ff.
[6] vi. 67 ff.
[7] vi. 71 ff.
[8] vi. 162 f., 272.

Taylor's doctrine is lucidly expressed, and is in general accordance with Evangelical doctrine. Our Lord's words at the institution were used figuratively; a non-local presence in or under the forms of bread and wine is meaningless; Christ is present at the Holy Communion, not after the manner of a spirit, but to our spirits only, and that in the reception of the elements; the change in the bread and wine by consecration is similar to that in the water of Baptism; and the wicked receive only the bare symbols. This is the doctrine of the Church of England and of Protestants generally.

Herbert Thorndike (1598–1672) was Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, for many years, but during the Civil War he was ejected from that and other offices. In 1661 he was appointed Prebendary of Westminster; he was a member of the Savoy Conference, and assisted in the revision of the Prayer Book. This learned divine made many references to the doctrine of the Holy Communion in his voluminous writings, and his standpoint is of considerable interest. But, in considering his theological speculations, it must be realised that he lived, and wrote the *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England* (1659), at a time when that Church seemed in ruins; indeed his plan involved a large reconstruction of the Western Church, whose unity had been broken by the Reformation. His opinions, however, were unpopular, nor can he be accounted a representative theologian; and his biographer, A. W. Haddan, laments that his very name became almost forgotten even among divines.

---

[1] vi. 669.

His later book, *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, shows him to be a strong opponent of Romanism. Moreover, in his *Judgment of the Church of Rome*, where he expresses his views in the most concise way, he says of Transubstantiation: "The Church of Rome enjoineth to believe transubstantiation, and to profess that which is false. For there is Scripture and tradition for the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist; but neither Scripture nor tradition for transubstantiation, viz. for abolishing the elements. But the Church of Rome enjoins to believe it." . . . "The Council of Trent 'commends' the mass without the Communion,[1] wherein it erreth."[2] And in the *Epilogue* he condemns the "new device of concomitance." He also rejected the doctrine of Consubstantiation, "for what needs the flesh and blood of Christ fill the same dimensions, which the substance of the elements possesseth, both being united with His spirit? And truly they that invite the Lutherans to their communion, professing consubstantiation, must not make transubstantiation an error in the foundation of faith."[4] Thorndike's theory of the spiritual presence may be seen in the two following passages:

> "If the Church only pray that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the body and blood of Christ, so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements in their bodily substance; because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit, to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His flesh and blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that, I suppose, is reason enough to call it the body and blood of Christ sacramentally, that is to say, as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist."[5] . . . "The flesh and blood of Christ by incarnation, the elements by consecration, being united to

---

[1] Ch. vi.
[2] v. 615 f.
[3] iv. 577 f.
[4] v. 174.
[5] iv. 69.

> the Spirit, that is, the Godhead of Christ, become both one sacramentally, by being both one with the Spirit or Godhead of Christ, to the conveying of God's Spirit to a Christian."[1]

So his "particular notion" was, as Archbishop Wake put it, "that the elements by consecration were united to the Godhead of Christ, much after the same manner as His natural body was by incarnation, and that so the very elements became after a sort His body."[2]

Several points are to be noted in his teaching. The consecration of the elements is effected not by the recital of the words, "This is my body," etc., but by the prayer of the congregation:

> "In the true sense of the Church they are consecrated, that is, deputed to be this Sacrament, and to the effect of it, by the prayer of the congregation, grounded upon the institution of Christ and the promise which it implieth."

The consecrated elements are only called in a sense the body and blood of Christ:

> "What shall we then say, when the name of Christ's body and blood is attributed to the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but that God would have us understand a supernatural conjunction and union between the body and blood of Christ and the said bread and wine, whereby they become as truly the instrument of conveying God's Spirit to them who receive as they ought, as the same Spirit was always in His natural body and blood?"[4] . . . When S. Ambrose saith that after consecration the body of the Lord and His blood only is named, and signified, and expressed, this also seems to import a great abatement of the proper signification of the body and blood of Christ."[5]

So in summing up the patristic evidence, he says: "It shall be enough, that they all acknowledge the elements to be changed, translated and turned into the substance of Christ's body and blood, though as in a Sacrament, that is, mystically."[6]

With regard to the prayer concerning the elements in the Canon of the Mass, "That they may become to us the body and blood," etc., he writes:

---

[1] v. 173.
[2] Gibson, x. 75.
[3] i. 342, *cf.* iv. 50 ff.
[4] iv. 25.
[5] i. 351.
[6] iv. 73.

"These words 'to us' make an abatement in the proper signification of the body and blood. For the elements may be said to become the body and blood of Christ without addition, in the same true sense in which they are so called in the Scriptures. But when they are said to become the body and blood of Christ to them that communicate, that true sense is so well signified and expressed, that the words cannot well be understood otherwise than to import not the corporal substance, but the spiritual use of them."[1]

"The liturgies themselves . . . do limit the being and presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements to the benefit of them that shall communicate."[2]

He rejected the theory of a local presence:

"Seeing the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God's right hand . . . His body we must understand to be confined to that place where the majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne. . . .[3] "Is it any way pertinent to the spiritual eating of them (Christ's flesh and blood) that they are bodily present? Is it not far more proper to that which our Lord was about (tending, without question, to the spiritual union which He seeks with His Church), that He should be understood to promise the mystical than the bodily presence of them in the Sacrament?"[4] . . . "How is it requisite, that they be there in bodily substance, as if the mystical presence of them were not a sufficient means to convey His spirit, which we see is conveyed by the mere spiritual consideration and resolution of a lively and effectual faith."[5]

Thorndike is a perplexing writer to sum up impartially. But he referred to himself as a Catholic Protestant;[6] and that probably is the fairest description of his eucharistic doctrine, though it needs the further qualification that his standpoint was peculiar to himself.

The Puritan School.

Richard Crakanthorp (1567–1624), Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, who had a great reputation for patristic learning, wrote his able *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae* in answer to the attack made by De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato. Within a comparatively small compass he deals with many subjects; there is much wit and sarcasm in the book, and Anthony Wood said it "was held to be the most exact piece for controversy since the time of the Reformation."[1]

---

[1] i. 350.
[2] iv. 126.
[3] iv. 48.
[4] iv. 27.
[5] iv. 32.
[6] v. 380.

Crakanthorp examines the statement of De Dominis: "The real and bodily presence of the Lord's body and blood in the most holy mysteries of the Eucharist is to us most certain." He ridicules this "certainty," for

> "you have no certainty at all that he who consecrates is a priest, or even baptized, or that he intends to do what the Church does, or that the bread is ever transubstantiated into the body of Christ, or that transubstantiation is possible . . . yet you are 'most certain' concerning the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, though your 'certainty' does not come from Scripture, nor from the testimony of the ancient fathers, nor from sense, nor from reason; but about this you are cherishing an opinion that is merely vain, foolish and impossible, and paying court to it as the idol of your hearts."[2]

Two consequences follow from the rejection of Transubstantiation: As Christ is not in the Eucharist bodily, His body and blood cannot be offered except in a figure and by way of commemoration, and there is no real and properly so-called sacrifice.[3] The Church of Rome is really idolatrous. He asks why, if there is no suspicion of idolatry in the adoration of the Eucharist, so many books have been written by Romanists to clear themselves of the charge. He examines the statement of De Dominis: "We adore with true worship (*latria*) the body of Christ lying hid under the species, which is in itself adorable because of the personal union." To this he replies: "You have well and significantly said 'lying hid.' For certainly it lies hid from the eyes of the body, the eyes of reason, the eyes of men, the eyes of angels, the eyes that are glorified, the eyes of others, the eyes of Christ Himself." He says that they might with equal reason fall at the feet of any man to show worship

---

[1] *Athenae Oxon.* ii. 362, ed. Bliss.

[2] Ch. lxxi., *Sec.* 2.

[3] Ch. lxxiv., *Ss.* 1 and 2.

(*latria*) to Christ lying hid in him;[1] and in a later chapter he adds: "You give to bread and wine, that is, to creatures, the worship and service which are due to the Creator alone, than which there is nothing more properly idolatry."[2]

Crakanthorp held that by consecration the elements are changed from common and ordinary use to a sacred and heavenly use: "The words of Christ are not literal, but figurative and tropical, and the bread was called His body by Christ because it is a sacred sign not only signifying but also bestowing the true body of Christ on believers instrumentally, but spiritually."[3] "There is no change in the substance, as there is none in the stones of the altar, or in a man elevated to the priesthood, or in water sanctified for Baptism; but the change is only accidental in the use, in the effect, in the virtue, in the office of the bread and wine, as is the change in the stones, in a priest, in the water of Baptism."[4]

Lewis Bayly (d. 1631), Bishop of Bangor, published at the beginning of the seventeenth century his *Practice of Piety*, which achieved extraordinary popularity, for seventy-four editions had been issued by the year 1821. He held that the elements are changed by consecration "in use and in name," for they are "destined to an holy use," and

> "they are now called by the name of those holy things which they signify, the body and blood of Christ; the better to draw our minds from those outward elements to the heavenly graces, which, by the sight of our bodies, they represent to the spiritual eyes of our faith. Neither did Christ direct these words, 'This is My body, this is My blood,' to the bread and wine; but to His disciples, as appears by the words going before, 'Take ye, eat ye.' Neither is the bread His body, but in the same sense that the cup is the New Testament, viz. by a sacramental metonomy. And S. Mark notes plainly, that the words 'This is My blood,' etc., were not pronounced by our Saviour till after that all His disciples had drunk of the cup."[5]

The presence is thus described:

> "Christ in the action of the Sacrament, really giveth

---

[1] Ch. lxxi. *Ss.* 1, 3 and 5.
[2] Ch. lxxiv. *S.* 3.
[3] Ch. lxxii. *S.* 9, 19.
[4] Ch. lxxiii. *S.* 23.
[5] Mark xiv. 23 f.

His very body and blood to every faithful receiver . . . Christ is verily present in the Sacrament by a double union; whereof the first is spiritual, between Christ and the worthy receiver; the second is sacramental, between the body and blood of Christ and the outward signs in the Sacrament. The former is wrought by means that the same Holy Spirit, dwelling in Christ and in the faithful, incorporates the faithful, as members to Christ, their Head, and so makes them one with Christ. . . . It is not our faith that makes the body and blood of Christ to be present, but the spirit of Christ dwelling in Him and us. . . . The other, being the sacramental union, is not a physical or local, but a spiritual conjunction of the earthly signs, which are bread and wine, with the heavenly graces, which are the body and blood of Christ in the act of receiving, as if by a mutual relation they were but one and the same thing. Hence it is that in the same instant of time that the worthy receiver eats with his mouth the bread and wine of the Lord, he eateth also with the mouth of his faith the very body and blood of Christ. Not that Christ is brought down from heaven to the Sacrament, but that the Holy Spirit by the Sacrament lifts up his mind unto Christ; not by any local mutation, but by a devout affection: so that in the holy contemplation of faith he is at that present with Christ, and Christ with him. . . . How the Holy Ghost makes the body of Christ, being absent from us in place, to be present with us by our union, Saint Paul terms a great mystery,[1] such as our understanding cannot worthily comprehend."[2]

The bread is the body of Christ by a sacramental metonymy. It is not under the forms of bread and wine, but in the action of the Sacrament that Christ gives His body and blood, and the reception is limited to the worthy receivers. Bishop Bayly evidently held the Receptionist doctrine of the Holy Communion.

CAROLINE MODERATES.

Richard Field (1561–1616), Dean of Gloucester, was a friend of Hooker and one of the most learned theologians of the reign of James I, and his work, *Of the Church*, has been held in very high estimation. He deals with the Roman controversy in general, but in the main abstains from the severe language used by many writers of the period. Indeed, he showed a strong desire to minimise the doctrinal differences of Christendom, and expressed some interesting and unusual points of view.

---

[1] Ephes. v. 32.

[2] Pp. 224 f., 232 f.

He went even so far as to represent the difference between Luther and Zwingli and others as due to a misunderstanding, for

> "Luther uttered many things very passionately against Zuinglius and others, conceiving that they made the Sacraments to be nothing, but only notes distinctive, serving to put difference between Christians and such as are no Christians, as a monk's cowl distinguisheth a monk from him that is no monk, or empty signs, without all presence of grace, and exhibition of the things they signify. But if he had fully understood the meaning of them he was so violently opposite unto, he would not have censured them so hardly as he did."[1]

He believed that formerly the Roman Church was near the Protestant Churches in doctrine, and that "the maintainers of those errors, superstitions, abuses, and Papal tyranny, which we dislike, were . . . but a faction only."[2] Consequently he claimed that the best theologians of the Middle Ages held the views of the English Reformers on the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion: "The best and worthiest amongst the guides of God's Church before Luther's time taught as we do, that the sacrifice of the altar is only the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and a mere representation and commemoration of the sacrifice once offered on the cross."[3] He endeavoured to show that the Roman Canon of the Mass was unobjectionable to Reformed theology: "For the Canon of the Mass, rightly understood, is found to contain nothing in it contrary to the rule of faith and the profession of the Protestant Churches."[4]

But his calm assurance nearly breaks down when he refers to "the monstrous conceit of Popish transubstantiation."[5] The best Roman divines show it is impossible; there is no agreement about it; in fact, he is persuaded "there are more material and real differences amongst them touching

[1] *Works*, iv. 410. [2] ii. 9. [3] ii. 94. [4] ii. 96. [5] iv. 304.

this one Sacrament than there are appearing differences or controversies, amongst those of our religion, touching all points of religion": it is "full of uncertainty, contrariety and contradiction, and doth testify against itself, that it is not of God."[1]

Field is a perplexing writer because, in his desire to minimise doctrinal differences, he strained after agreement with the statements of such men as Zanchi the Reformer on the one side and Cassander a Roman theologian of a mediating position on the other. But he claimed to hold a Protestant doctrine of the Eucharist, and strongly insisted on the deep gulf between his own doctrine and that of Rome. It is safe to say that there was a decided Evangelical tone in his teaching on the subject.

He rejected "the real, that is, the local presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament," though he held that "the sanctified elements" reserved in the Early Church (a practice he disliked) "in reference to an ensuing receiving of them were the body of Christ, to wit, in mystery and exhibitive signification," but he added "that they are no Sacrament but in reference to the use to which they were appointed by Almighty God."[2]

He approved Zanchi's statement: "The elements of bread and wine, presenting to our consideration the spiritual nourishing force that is in the body and blood of Christ, are . . . only changed in use, in that they do not only signify, but exhibit and communicate unto us the very body and blood of Christ, with all the gracious working of the same."[3]

After saying "There is only a spiritual eating of Christ," he defined it as "by meditation upon the several and distinct things that are found in His natures, powers, actions and sufferings; a trajection from the understanding part to the heart, and an incorporation of the believer into him."[4] Moreover, although he was trying to narrow the difference between the Lutherans and other Protestants, he took exception to the doctrine, which Luther had held to some extent that the wicked eat the body of Christ in the Sacrament.[5]

---

[1] *Works*, i. 344 ff. [2] iv. 487 f. [3] iv. 408. [4] iv. 409. [5] iv. 409.

Thomas Rogers (d. 1616), who had been Chaplain to Bancroft when he was Bishop of London, issued in 1607 a book (enlarged from an earlier work) entitled *The Faith, Doctrine and Religion professed and protected in the realm of England and Dominions of the same, expressed in* 39 *Articles.* It had a special importance, for the title-page bore the words "perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England allowed to the public"; and Archbishop Bancroft ordered that a copy be bought for every parish in the province of Canterbury. It was the chief work on the Articles until Burnet's appeared in 1699, and it was constantly reprinted during the seventeenth century.[1]

"Abominable," he says, "be the Popish errors, viz. that . . . under each kind, and under every part of each kind severally, whole Christ is comprised."[2] Among the adversaries to the truth of Article XXVIII are "the Synusiasts or Ubiquitaries, which think the body of Christ so is present in the supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant, is eaten corporally and received into the belly."[3]

His doctrinal beliefs are expressed tersely and vigorously. The body and blood of Christ are present only at the reception of the elements, for among abominable Popish errors he includes the belief that "After the consecration in the wonderful Sacrament of the Eucharist the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is; and that not only in the use, while it is taken, but afore also, and after in the hosts, or consecrated pieces, reserved or remaining after the communion."[4]

Only the worthy communicants receive the body of Christ. Of those who receive unworthily he says: "These may receive the Sacrament, but not the true body of Christ."[5] And he adds: "The adversaries of this doctrine are the Ubiquitaries, both Lutheran and Popish; they saying the very body of Christ, at the Lord's Supper, is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly; these affirming that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus."[6]

---

[1] Goode, pp. 666 ff.
[2] P. 286 f.
[3] P. 289.
[4] P. 287.
[5] P. 292.
[6] P. 293.

On the subject of the adoration of the elements, he says that Transubstantiation:

> "hath been the occasion of much superstition and idolatry. For from hence proceeded the reservation of the transubstantiated bread for sundry superstitious purposes: hence the adoration of the bread, even as God Himself, and that both of priest and people: hence the carrying about, in pompous procession, of the wafer-god";[1] and on Corpus Christi day "the sacrament is . . . most idolatrously adored."[2]

Thomas Morton (1564–1659) was successively Bishop of Chester, Coventry and Lichfield, and (from 1632) Durham. He lived to be a very old man and was a link between the Church of the Elizabethan period and the Commonwealth. He was a skilled controversialist, possessed of great learning, and had an intimate acquaintance with Roman arguments. He wrote *A Catholic Appeal for Protestants* (1609); but his chief work on the Eucharist was *Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ* (*by some called*) *the masse of Christ* (1631). The eight books into which it is divided are described on the title page as "discovering the superstitious, sacrilegious and idolatrous abominations of the Romish masse," a heading which indicates the severe language he used on the subject, and his uncompromising hostility to the Roman Church. He adduces much evidence to prove that Transubstantiation is not to be found in the Fathers.[3] He devotes the whole of Book 7 to the idolatrous adoration of the Sacrament, and shows that it cannot be justified by any of the pretences alleged on its behalf, and that adoration should not be given to the bread and wine any more than to the waters of Baptism.[4]

He denied the bodily presence of Christ, and held that our Lord's words at the institution were used in a figurative sense, and that the faithful communicants receive the body of Christ spiritually by faith. In the course of his argument he dwelt upon the use of figurative speech in the Scriptures, and then appealed "to the venerable Senate both of Greek and Latin fathers; the Greek generally calling the elements of bread and wine in this Sacrament, some types, anti-types and symbols (that is) figures and signs. . . . These phrases of signs and symbols are most frequent in the writings of all the Greek fathers'';[1] . . . "as for the direct and perspicuous sentences of these Latin fathers, they clearly and exactly teach a figurative sense in the words of Christ," and after quoting Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine, he adds, "these sentences of these holy fathers are so fully consonant to the doctrine of Protestants as that if the names of these fathers had been concealed, our reader might think that he heard Bucer, Calvin or Beza speak."[2]

---

[1] *Goode*, p. 286.
[2] P. 291.
[3] *Of the Institution*, Book 3.
[4] Book 8, ch. ii., *Ss.* 2 and 3.

He gave another reason for the figurative interpretation: "We are urged by the rule set down by S. Augustine for the direction of the whole Catholic Church, that 'whensoever the precept (saith he) seemeth to command that which is heinous (as to eat the flesh of Christ) it is figurative.'"[3] And "our last persuasion is the consent of antiquity against the literal conversion of bread into Christ's body (which you call transubstantiation) against the literal corporal presence, against literal corporal eating, and union, and against a proper sacrifice of Christ's body subjectively; all which are fully persuasive inducements to inforce a figurative sense."[4]

But he insisted that Protestants held no inadequate belief on the Eucharist, for

> "our difference is not about the truth or reality of presence, but about the true manner of the being and receiving thereof;"[5] . . . "The bread is called Christ's body figuratively, as being a sign or figure of Christ's body, yet such a figure as doth truly convey unto us the thing signified thereby, for the which truth's sake Christ said not 'This bread is a figure of my body,' but 'it is my body,' wherein we see two things plainly professed by all Protestants; first, that the words of the Sacrament are not to be expounded according to their literal and proper sense; secondly, that the matter of this Sacrament is the very body and blood of our Lord truly offered and exhibited unto us . . . More than erroneous is that censure which our adversaries have passed upon Protestant

---

[1] Book 2, ch. ii, *S*. 6. [2] Book 2, ch. ii, *S*. 9.

[3] *De Doct. Christ.*, Book 3, cap. 16.

[4] *Of the Institution*, Book 2, ch. iii, *S*. 6.

[5] *Cath. Appeal*, Book 2, ch. ii, *S*. 1, p. 93.

> churches . . . traducing their doctrine as though they maintained, with ancient heretics, only a figure of Christ's body."[1] . . . "So in this Sacrament the donor is Christ, the gift is His precious body and blood, the high ransom of man's redemption, conveyed unto mankind by the word and Sacrament, as by a visible deed of gift under the signs and seals of common elements of bread and wine, consecrated to that use; the right receiver is the penitent and faithful communicant."

But he recognised that the similitude of a deed does not express the whole truth of the blessings given in the Sacrament:

> "This similitude agreeth for the manner, albeit for the effectualness of the manner we say, that the odds is no less than heaven and earth. For by this faithful participation there is wrought in the godly Christian an ineffable and incomprehensible union and conjunction through faith with the humanity of Christ his Redeemer, whereby he is also made partaker of the Divine nature."[2]

To put Morton's doctrine briefly—our Lord's words at the institution are to be understood not literally, but figuratively, yet He said: "This is My body" instead of "This is a figure of My body" because the consecrated bread and wine convey to us the thing signified. The body and blood of Christ are received spiritually by the worthy communicant by faith, but the wicked do not receive the body and blood.

Joseph Hall (1574–1656), successively Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, was at first inclined to Puritanism, but came to have affinities with the Laudian school, though his views were not above suspicion in Laud's eyes. He was a well-known writer who combined simplicity and force with learning and sound judgment. He did not agree with those who scrupled to speak about the manner of the presence in the Holy Communion.[3] The Church of England undoubtedly holds, according to him, that the body of Christ is not corporally, but spiritually, present and received in the Holy Communion:

> "Since therefore the body of Christ cannot be said to be corporally present or received by us, it must needs follow

---

[1] *Ibid. Ss.* 24 and 26, pp. 121 f., 127.
[2] *Ibid. S.* 28, pp. 130 f.
[3] *Works*, ix. 437 ff.

that there is no way of His presence or receipt in the Sacrament, but spiritual, which the Church of England hath laboured so fully to express, both in her holy liturgy and publicly authorised homilies, that there is no one point of divine truth which she hath more punctually and plainly laid down before us."[1]

His adherence to Evangelical doctrine may be seen from other expressions of his belief. The elements remain bread and wine, but they convey to the faithful receiver the body and blood of Christ: "Still, it is bread and wine, in respect of the nature and essence of it; but so, that, in the spiritual use of it, it conveys to the faithful receiver the body and blood of Christ."[2]

He maintained that it is the crucified, not the glorified, body of Christ, for of the words "This is my body which is given for you," he wrote: "This was the body which was given for them, betrayed, crucified, humbled to the death; not the glorious body of Christ, which should be capable of ten thousand places at once, both in heaven and earth, invisible, incircumscriptible"; and he added in regard to the words "Do this in remembrance of me." "Remembrance implies an absence."[3]

James Ussher (1581–1656), Archbishop of Armagh, who during the Irish troubles was made Bishop of Carlisle *in commendam*, stands supreme among the great divines of the seventeenth century for very wide and deep learning, "a giant among giants." His doctrine of the Holy Communion is to be found chiefly in a learned *Sermon preached before the Commons House of Parliament*[4] in 1620, and in *An Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit.*[5]

Of our Lord's words at the institution, he says "the things, which He honoured with those names, cannot be really His body and blood, but figuratively and sacramentally."[6] This Evangelical interpretation of the Holy Communion he supported by further arguments. In showing that the Sacrament is more than a sign, he compares the bread and wine, not to the picture of a King, but to the wax on his letters patent:

---

[1] *Works*, ix. p. 439.
[2] ix. 441.
[3] ix. 336.
[4] *Ibid.* ii.
[5] *Ibid.* iii.
[6] iii. 68.

"He that hath in his chamber the picture of the French King, hath but a bare sign, which possibly may make him think of that King, when he looketh on it, but showeth not that he hath any manner of interest in him. It is otherwise with him that hath the King's great seal for the confirmation of the title that he hath unto all the lands and livelihood which he doth enjoy. And as here, the wax that is affixed to those letters patent, howsoever for substance it be the very same with that which is to be found everywhere, yet being applied to this use, is of more worth to the patentee than all the wax in the country beside; so standeth it with the outward elements in the matter of the Sacrament. The bread and wine are not changed in substance from being the same with that which is served at ordinary tables; but in respect of the sacred use whereunto they are consecrated, such a change is made that now they differ as much from common bread and wine as heaven from earth. Neither are they to be accounted barely significative, but truly exhibitive also, of those heavenly things whereto they have relation, as being appointed by God to be a means of conveying the same unto us, and putting us in actual possession thereof. So that in the use of this holy ordinance, as verily as a man with his bodily hand and mouth receiveth the earthly creatures, so verily doth he with his spiritual hand and mouth, if any such he have, receive the body and blood of Christ."[1]

He agrees with Bishop Andrewes that it is the presence of the crucified body: "The truth which must be held is this: that we do not here receive only the benefits that flow from Christ, but the very body and blood of Christ; that is, Christ Himself crucified."[2] But he denies that "the body and blood of Christ is in such a manner present, under the outward shows of bread and wine, that whosoever receiveth the one, be he good or bad, believer or unbeliever, doth therewith really receive the other."[3]

John Hales (1584–1656), "the ever memorable," Fellow of Eton and Canon of Windsor, was a divine of large and generous human sympathy, who by reason of his comprehensive and tolerant attitude was a pioneer of Latitudinarian thought. In *A Tract on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (published probably before 1637), he held that Protestants generally had made two mistakes.

---

[1] *Works*, ii. 428 f.

[2] ii. 429.

[3] iii. 52.

They wrongly considered the words of consecration to be necessary to the Sacrament. Our Lord had necessarily used words at the institution, for otherwise His action would not have been understood. But He left no precept for saying any words; He merely commanded us to do what He did. "It was the farther solemnising, and beautifying that holy action, which brought the Canon in, and not an opinion of adding anything to the substance of the action." So Hales objects to the words of S. Ambrose: "The word approaches the element, and it becomes a Sacrament;"[1] for "to the perfection of a Sacrament . . . it is sufficient that one thing be done whereby another is signified, though nothing be said at all." Then no little superstition that adheres to the consecration would disappear.[2]

Protestants have been mistaken in teaching a real presence and participation of Christ's body in the Sacrament. This notion, at once novel and false, was to be traced to Martin Bucer, who feared to seem to go too far from the Church of Rome. From him it passed to Calvin, Beza and the Reformed Churches generally. The phrase, "not after a carnal but after a spiritual manner," which seems to moderate the tenet, is not understandable language. It is untrue to say that "it is the body of God, into which the bread is transubstantiated," or "with which the bread is consubstantiated"; or "that the bread remaining what it was, there passes with it to the soul the real body of God, in a secret unknown manner"; or "that a further degree of faith is supplied us"; or "that some degree of God's grace, whatever it be, is exhibited which otherwise would be wanting."

He summarises his positive statement:

> "First, in the Communion there is nothing given but bread and wine.
>
> Secondly, the bread and wine are signs indeed, but not of anything there exhibited, but of somewhat given long since, even of Christ given for us upon the Cross, sixteen hundred years ago and more.

---

[1] Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fiat sacramentum. [2] Pp. 52 ff.

Thirdly, Jesus Christ is eaten at the Communion-table in no sense, neither spiritually by virtue of anything done there, not really; neither metaphorically, nor literally. Indeed that which is eaten (I mean the bread) is called Christ by a metaphor; but it is eaten truly and properly.

Fourthly, the spiritual eating of Christ is common to all places, as well as the Lord's table.

Last of all, the uses and ends of the Lord's Supper can be no more than such as are mentioned in the Scriptures, and they are but two:

(*a*) The commemoration of the death and passion of the Son of God, specified by Himself at the institution of the ceremony.

(*b*) To testify our union with Christ, and communion one with another; which end S. Paul hath taught us.

In these few conclusions the whole doctrine and use of the Lord's Supper is fully set down; and whoso leadeth you beyond this, doth but abuse you: *quicquid ultra quaeritur, non intelligitur.*"[1]

The section on the Sacraments in the Catechism was added to the Book of Common Prayer at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, at which the bishops and the Puritan party were represented. It is believed to have been written by John Overall, Dean of S. Paul's, who eventually became Bishop of Norwich. The attempt to find in it the theory that the body and blood of Christ are present as a result of consecration, and previous to reception, was largely based on a mistaken idea of Overall's own views, which has now been abandoned; and, in any case, it was the Catechism accepted by the Conference, whatever were the author's views. A minute and searching examination by Dimock shows the Evangelical character of the doctrine contained in the Catechism.[2]

The section on the Sacraments was added at the express desire of the Puritans and to meet their views; they raised no objection to the teaching contained in it; and at the Savoy Conference in 1662, though the Puritans criticised the Catechism, they raised no objection to the teaching on the Holy Communion. It uses the ordinary language of Reformed theology about the Holy Communion, and was so interpreted in the long series of commentaries on the Catechism, which appeared from time to time during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[1]

---

[1] Pp. 56 ff.

[2] *Euch. Pres.*, pp. 186 ff.

The only change that concerned the doctrine of the Holy Communion, made in the revision of 1662, was the addition at the end of the Communion Service of the Declaration on kneeling, or the "Black Rubric." This had been desired by the Puritans at the Savoy Conference; and the bishops had eventually agreed to its restoration, but their objection to it had been as follows: "This rubric is not in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law, nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry. Besides the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the twenty-eighth article of the Church of England."[2] However, the revisers condemned the adoration of the "corporal presence," thereby emphasising the earlier condemnation of the phrase "real and essential presence." The disputed question, therefore, is whether any doctrinal change was thereby intended.[3]

It has been suggested that the purpose of the change was to limit the condemnation "to such a gross and carnal presence as was contrary to the teaching of the mediæval theologians and the Tridentine divines."[4] The evidence alleged for this view is a statement of Bishop Burnet[5] to the effect that the author of the change pretended that it would admit of such a presence as "that by the virtue of the words of consecration, there was a cylinder of a vacuum made between the elements and Christ's body in Heaven, so that, no body being between, it was both in Heaven and in the elements." But to what extent this person may have been responsible for the change, it is hardly conceivable that the Revisers can have been influenced by what Burnet called "such a solemn piece of folly as this."

On the other hand, there was a good reason for the change of statement. As it has already been shown, the term "real presence" had come into use in the Church of England, and was no longer associated only with Romanist or Lutheran doctrine. If the Declaration had stood as it was, the term

---

[1] Goode, pp. 697 ff.

[2] E. Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences*, p. 354.

[3] Dimock, *Euch. Pres.*, pp. 305 ff., 385 ff., 548 ff.

[4] Darwell Stone, ii. 319.

[5] *Hist. of Ref.*, iii. 8 (1865).

"real presence" would have been extremely embarrassing, as our divines were using the term in a Reformed sense. The change, therefore, from "real and essential presence" to "corporal presence" was really introduced in order to distinguish Anglican from Roman doctrine.

This explanation of the change is supported by the considerations that the bishops implied that they desired no change in the sense of the Declaration, and can therefore have wished for no change in doctrine. Moreover, Burnet tells us: "The Papists were highly offended when they saw such an express declaration made against the real presence."[1] Finally, the Black Rubric was regarded by our divines not as allowing any adoration of the elements, but as a safeguard against it.

Among the *Constitutions and Canons for the Church of England*, sanctioned by Convocation in 1640 and which received the assent of the Crown, occur the following passages in No. 7, which have particular interest because of the influence of the Laudian School at that period: "At the time of the reforming of this Church from that gross superstition of Popery, it was carefully provided that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people both the inclination thereunto and memory thereof, especially of the idolatry committed in the Mass, for which cause all Popish altars were demolished. . . . We declare that this situation of the holy table doth not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, wherein Christ is again really sacrificed." This is followed by a recommendation to do "reverence and obeisance" at coming in and going out of Church, but "not with any intention . . . to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table, or in mystical elements."[2]

(*For Bibliography, cf. infra p. 262 f.*)

---

[1] *Hist. of My Own Times*, i. 324, ed. 1897.

[2] Laud's *Works*, V, pt. ii, 625 f.

VII. ANTI-ROMAN APOLOGETICS (*continued*).

THE NONJURORS AND HANOVERIANS.

W. H. Mackean.

The Nonjuring School.

John Johnson (1662–1725), Vicar of Cranbrook, Kent, a very able writer, published (1714–7) a learned treatise on *The Unbloody Sacrifice.* He was not a Nonjuror himself, but was the chief advocate of the doctrine of the Holy Communion held by those who seceded, and his influence as a theologian is to be seen among them. It is therefore convenient to include him in this section, rather than among the High Churchmen among whom he would otherwise be placed.

He taught that the consecration of the bread and wine is effected not merely by reciting the words of institution, but also by the oblation of the symbols to God the Father, and by the prayer of invocation for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine, which become the sacramental body and blood of Christ.[1] They are not actually the body and blood but they are so "in power and effect," or "in inward life and spirit," or "in mystery and inward power."[2] This view of the effect of consecration may be seen also in the following passages:

> "The bread and wine are not the body and blood, in themselves considered, nor merely by their resembling or representing the body and blood, but by the inward invisible power of the Spirit; by which the sacramental body and blood are made as powerful and effectual for the ends of religion, as the natural body itself could be if it was present. And it is on this account that it is called Christ's spiritual and mysterious body, as being discerned to be what it is by the inward, not the outward eye; by our faith, our minds and spirits, not our senses. . . . Though bread and wine in themselves can be no

---

[1] *Works*, i. 329 ff.

[2] i. 251, ii. 73, 86.

more than figures, yet when the Holy Ghost has blessed and sanctified them, they are in power and effect to us the same that the archetypes would be."[1]

"The ancients . . . believed the material bread and wine to be the spiritual body and blood of Christ, on account of the presence and invisible operation of the Holy Ghost, in and by those elements . . . the Holy Ghost, at the prayers of the priests and people, is in a peculiar manner present and imparts a secret power to the sacramental body and blood, by which they are made to be in energy and effect, though not in substance, the very body and blood which they represent."[2]

"Though the Eucharistical elements are not the substantial body and blood; nay, they are the figurative and representative symbols of them; yet they are somewhat more too; they are the mysterious body and blood of our ever-blessed Redeemer. By the mysterious body and blood. . . . I mean neither substantial nor yet merely figurative, but the middle between these extremes, viz. the bread and wine made the body and blood of Christ by the secret power of the Spirit; and apprehended to be so, not by our senses, but by our faith, directed and influenced by the same Holy Spirit; and made the body and blood in such a manner as human reason cannot perfectly comprehend."[3]

"Transubstantiation is proverbially irrational; consubstantiation comes not much behind it; and the spiritual presence, as explained by Beza and his associates, is as unintelligible as either of the former." . . .[4] "We are so far from believing, that Christ literally offers Himself in the Eucharist, that we do not believe Him to be personally there present in His human nature."[5]

Those who seceded from the Church of England as Nonjurors included among them able theologians such as George Hickes, Thomas Brett, Thomas Deacon, etc., whose Virtualist doctrine was similar to Johnson's; and in an interesting statement, addressed in 1722 to the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Nonjurors maintained the figurative interpretation of cur Lord's words at the institution; and they most willingly confessed a change in the elements, namely,

---

[1] *Works*, i. 266. [2] i. 267 f. [3] i. 323. [4] i. 315. [5] i. 201.

"that there is a mystic virtue and supernatural force transfused upon the elements by the priest's pronouncing the words of consecration and his prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost."[1]

Several points are to be noted in the general theory of the Nonjurors. As an express invocation of the Holy Spirit which is lacking in the Book of Common Prayer, was an important feature in their doctrine, their theory was not widely held in the Church of England; indeed, it was judged by Dr. Brett to be irreconcilable with the Consecration prayer, though he was anxious to believe that the Church of England held the Nonjuror's doctrine;[2] moreover, it received a serious blow from the fair but adverse criticism of Waterland. According to the Nonjurors, the body and blood of Christ are not in or under the forms of bread and wine; but the bread and wine become the sacramental body and blood; they are the body and blood of Christ in power and effect, or, as Hickes says, "by divine fiction."[3] There is, therefore, no resemblance to Roman doctrine; Nonjuring teaching was condemned by Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, a theologian of the Oxford movement,[4] and was criticised by Bishop A. P. Forbes as practically amounting to what he called "the real absence of our Lord therefrom,"[5] a description which, however unfair, seems to imply the Evangelical nature of the Nonjurors' doctrine.

Thomas Ken (1637–1711), Bishop of Bath and Wells, who became a Nonjuror, evidently held an Evangelical doctrine of the Holy Communion. He taught that the reception of the bread and wine is not necessarily the reception of the body and blood of Christ, but only so to faithful recipients. In his *Exposition of the Church Catechism* he limits the receiving of "both parts of the Sacrament" to those who "with due preparation" receive "the signs"[6]: and in the *Manual of Prayer* he says: "I verily believe that if with due preparation I come to the altar, as certainly as I receive the outward signs, so certainly shall I receive the thing signified, even Thy most blessed body and blood."[7]

His *Exposition of the Church Catechism* was published in

---

[1] T. Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors*, pp. 335, 339.
[2] Pref. pp. xix ff. [3] *Works*, ii. 159f. [4] P. 312.
[5] P. 503. [6] *Prose Works*, p. 318. [7] P. 404.

1685, but a revised edition was issued in the following year, which was followed by all later editions. In the 1686 edition he says that "to prevent all misunderstandings for the future," he has in his revising "made some few little alterations, not at all varying his meaning."[1] One alteration is noteworthy. The expression "art present on the altar" in the first edition was changed in the second and later editions to "art present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver."[2]

In 1687 a Roman Catholic published a pamphlet, attacking a sermon in which Ken had preached "with much vehemency against the real presence." He says, "I saw you exhorted with passion your people not to be tottered by every blast of wind, that shall say, Christ is on this altar, or Christ is on that altar, for Christ is actually in Heaven, and shall continue there till He comes to judge at the end of the world." Again, "Your Lordship must needs maintain, that what Christ gave, and His Apostles received, was nothing else but bread and wine." He then charges Ken with inconsistency: "For now you receive Christ's flesh and blood virtually, now figuratively, another time spiritually by faith, and in the Exposition of your Catechism you contradict all that in teaching the body and blood of Jesus Christ to be verily and indeed taken by the faithful in our Lord's Supper."[3] The writer could not understand that the words "verily and indeed," have an Evangelical interpretation.

THE "HIGH CHURCH" SCHOOL.

George Bull (1634–1710), Bishop of S. David's, was one of the most learned theologians and patristic scholars of his time, with a European reputation. He was a High Churchman, whose doctrine on the Holy Communion was strongly anti-Roman. The "very monstrous" doctrine of Transubstantiation, opposed as it is to sense and reason, he said, troubles and embarrasses even Romanists themselves;[4] and the belief that "the very body and blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men" is "an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture, Heb. vii. 27, and ix. 12, 25, 26, 28, and x. 12, 14."[1]

---

[1] P. 212. [2] P. 325.

[3] *Animadversions by way of Answer to a Sermon preached by Dr. Thomas Kenne*, pp. 9, 14, 17.

[4] *Works*, i. 14; ii. 203, 257 f.

He held that our Lord's words at the institution were figurative:

> "Now whatsoever Our Saviour said was undoubtedly true: but these words could not be true in a proper sense; for Our Saviour's body was not then given or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of His blood yet shed. The words, therefore, must necessarily be understood in a figurative sense; and then, what becomes of the doctrine of transubstantiation? The meaning of Our Saviour is plainly this: 'What I now do is a representation of My death and passion near approaching; and what I now do, do you hereafter, "do this in remembrance of Me"; let this be a standing, perpetual ordinance in My church to the end of the world; let My death be thus annunciated and shown forth till I come to judgment.'"[2]

Moreover, the liturgies and patristic evidence are opposed to the doctrine of Transubstantiation:

> "In the Holy Eucharist then Christ is offered, not hypostatically,[3] as the Trent fathers have determined (for so He was but once offered), but commemoratively only; and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering, or putting ourselves in mind of Him. For every sacrifice is directed to God. . . . In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine, as 'figures or images of the precious blood of Christ shed for us, and of His precious body.'"[4] He continued later: "It (the Eucharist) was then (in the ancient church) believed to be an ἀνάμνησις or commemoration, by the symbols of bread and wine, of the body and blood of Christ, once offered up to God on the Cross for our redemption; it could not, therefore, be then thought an offering up again to God of the very body and blood of Christ, substantially present under the appearance

---

[1] *Works*, ii. 251. [2] ii. 254.

[3] For a defence of Bull's use of the term, *see* Dimock, *Fulham Conference*, p. 123.

[4] ii. 252.

> of bread and wine; for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. The ancient doctors, yea, and liturgies of the Church, affirm the Eucharist to be *incruentum sacrificium*, 'a sacrifice without blood,' which it cannot be said to be, if the very blood of Christ were therein present and offered up to God. In the Clementine liturgy, the bread and wine in the Eucharist are said to be *antitypa*, 'correspondent types,' figures and images of the precious body and blood of Christ. And divers others of the fathers speak in the same plain language. . . ."[1]

Bull inclined to a view similar to the Nonjuring doctrine, of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the elements:

> "that by or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are the body and blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is hypostatically united to the body of Christ in heaven, being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine on earth."

This notion he traces back to Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, and refers the reader to Grabe's notes on those fathers.[2] He denies that bread, however blessed and consecrated, can become Christ, and denounces the adoration of the host.[3]

William Beveridge (1637–1708), Bishop of S. Asaph, was one of the most learned divines. His works included *The Catechism Explained*, *The Great Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion*,[4] and the *Discourse upon the Thirty-nine Articles*.[5]

With reference to the institution he says:

> "The words 'This is My body' prove no more than that the bread was the sign or sacrament of His body, not at all that it is really changed into His body. . . . The very words of institution themselves are sufficient to convince any rational man, whose reason is not darkened by prejudice, that that of which Our Saviour said 'This is My body' was real bread, and so His body only in a figurative or sacramental sense; and by consequence that the bread was not turned into His body, but His body was only

---

[1] *Works*, ii. 254 f. [2] ii. 255 f. [3] ii. 309 f. [4] Vol. viii. [5] Vol. vii.

> represented by the bread. . . . That which we eat at the Sacrament is bread and not the very body of Christ; that which we drink, the cup or wine, and not the very blood of Christ."[1]

Transubstantiation is absurd, for

> "we do not eat the very body that hung upon the Cross, nor drink the blood which was there spilt for us, but only in a sacramental sense, which quite overthrows the doctrine of transubstantiation. . . . The elements are not transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, as the Papists absurdly imagine; but the substance of the bread and wine still continues the same; and therefore without faith no man can receive any more than plain, though consecrated, bread and wine."[2]

That the body of Christ is not really present is emphasised further: "If the bread be not really changed into the body of Christ, then the body of Christ is not really there present."[3] And "though it be not His very body and blood itself, it is the communion of them."[4]

So also is the emphasis reiterated that without faith the Lord's Supper is not really received at all:

> "The whole stress of this great work lies upon our faith. Unless that be duly exerted and acted, though men come to the Lord's Table, and feed upon the outward elements which are there given them, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper; for that is a spiritual banquet, which cannot be so much as tasted of, any otherwise than by faith. And, therefore, they who do not receive it with faith have no cause to complain that they are never the better for receiving the Lord's Supper; for they do really receive it no more than as if they were not present when it is administered, and so can expect no more benefit from it than from food or physic which they do not take."[5]

The adoration of the Sacrament is idolatrous, as the primitive Church believed.[6]

Henry Aldrich (1647–1710), Dean of Christ Church, published in 1687 a pamphlet which was held in high esteem by Waterland,[7] entitled *A Reply to Two Discourses*. He remarks on the term "real presence"—"The Protestants in King Henry the Eighth's time, that suffered upon the six articles, denied the real presence (i.e. the Popish sense of it), but meant the same thing with us, who think we may lawfully use that term."[1] Yet because of the difficulty of conceiving the real presence of what is locally absent,

---

[1] *Works*, vii. 475 ff.
[2] viii. 534, 546.
[3] vii. 482. f
[4] viii. 546.
[5] viii. 591.
[6] vii. 490.
[7] P. 188 f.

> "the Church of England has wisely forborn to use the term of 'real presence' in all the books that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church's nor Nowell's Catechism . . . so that if any Church of England man use it, he does more than the Church directs him; if any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him . . . yet it must not be denied, but the term may be safely used amongst scholars, and seems to be grounded upon the language of Scripture itself."[2]

As to how a thing that is locally absent may yet be really received, Aldrich gives the familiar example of the deeds of an estate, "The reception is confessedly real, though the thing itself is not locally or circumscriptively present."[3]

Of the meaning of the real presence he says: "In the Holy Eucharist the Sacrament is physically, the *res sacramenti* morally, present; the elements antecedently and locally, the very body consequentially and virtually, but both really present." In the next passage he explains the difference between the Roman doctrine and ours: "The Papists (however they express themselves) understand a local presence, which we deny. . . . We (whatever term we use) mean only a spiritual and virtual presence, and explain the term we make use of to that effect." He is careful to add, "it is likewise evident that when we say Christ is present, or adorable in the Sacrament, we do not mean in the elements, but in the celebration."[4]

But he wished to avoid what was called Zwinglianism, and continued: "We do not hold that we barely receive the effects and benefits of Christ's body; but we hold it really present, inasmuch as it is really received, and we actually put in possession of it, though locally absent from us."[5]

Thomas Wilson (1663–1755), the saintly Bishop of Sodor and Man, was a High Churchman, whose writings were mainly of a devotional character. His eucharistic doctrine was influenced by Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice,*[1] and was similar to that of the Nonjurors; like them he advocated the invocation of the Holy Spirit after the prayer of consecration;[2] and his references to the Holy Communion show that he held the Virtualist position.

---

[1] P. 17. [2] P. 15. [3] P. 14. [4] Pp. 16 f. [5] Pp. 17 f.

It is a means of remembering Christ's death. In commenting on 1 Cor. xi. 23 f., he says:

> "Now, what is there in this command that requires much learning to understand? Does not everybody at first sight apprehend that that which is required of Christians is to meet together, to break and eat bread after a religious manner, that is, with prayer and thanksgiving; to do this in remembrance of Christ's death; and to believe assuredly that God's blessing will attend their doing so? Here seems to be no difficulty in this, and yet he that understands this, knows as much as is necessary to be known, as much as the Gospel requires to be known, concerning this duty."[3]

So on another occasion he says: "When God's minister breaketh the bread and poureth out the wine and blesseth them, let them put you in remembrance of Christ's body broken and His blood shed upon the Cross for our redemption, and pray that they may be a means of conveying unto your soul all the benefits of His precious death."[4]

The elements are made "holy representatives of His body and blood," the "sacramental body and blood of Christ," the body and blood "in effect and power," by the operation of the Holy Spirit. A man "is not to look upon and receive this bread and wine as common food, but as holy representatives of Christ's body and blood, made such by an especial blessing of God."[5] Referring to the words "Do this," he says: "They could not offer His real body, but only His sacramental body, as a memorial of His real body . . . the bread and wine are by consecration made the sacramental body and blood of Christ."[6] "The power of the Holy Spirit accompanies these elements, and makes them effectual means of grace and salvation";[7] and "Being consecrated and received by us, they are the body and blood

[1] *Works,* iv. 119.
[2] v. 73 f.
[3] iii. 293.
[4] iv. 117.
[5] iii. 277.
[6] v. 339.
[7] v. 339.

of Christ, in virtue and power";[1] or, as he said elsewhere, "in effect and power, though not in substance."[2] In a note on the words of the Church Catechism, "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful," he remarked, "Verily and indeed—viz. as to its spiritual power and effect."[3]

THE LATITUDINARIAN SCHOOL.

John Tillotson (1630–1694), the famous preacher of his time, after being Dean of Canterbury and Dean of S. Paul's, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in 1691. While passing most of his life in Caroline times, his teaching laid the foundation for the Hanoverian Latitudinarians, although we have already examined the earliest manifestation of this school in the writings of John Hales.

Tillotson referred to Transubstantiation in his sermons usually in severe terms, and devoted one entirely to it. That "gross and palpable error,"[4] which he called a "misshapen monster," rose up in "the most dark and dismal time that ever happened to the Christian Church, both for ignorance and superstition and vice." Indeed, "the general ignorance and gross superstition of that age . . . disposed them to receive anything that came under a pretence of mystery in religion and of a greater reverence and devotion to the Sacrament";[5] and in all probability the common juggling expression hocus-pocus was but a corruption of *hoc est corpus* "by way of ridiculous imitation of the priests of the Church of Rome in their trick of transubstantiation."[6] He showed that it was neither the teaching of Scripture nor the belief of the ancient Church, that it is contrary to reason, and has caused infinite scandal to the Christian religion.

At the institution our Lord used figurative language, as is so frequently the case in the Scriptures: "This bread signifies My body, this cup signifies My blood," and Tillotson gives the usual illustration of the delivery of a deed:

> "Nothing is more common in all languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the sign, as the delivery of a deed or writing under hand and seal is called a conveyance or making over of such an estate:

---

[1] *Works*, iv. 120.
[2] iii. 294.
[3] iv. 84.
[4] ii. 409.
[5] ii. 433 ff.
[6] ii. 443.

> and it is really so—not the delivery of mere wax and parchment, but the conveyance of a real estate, as truly and really, to all effects and purposes of law, as if the very material houses and lands themselves could be and were actually delivered into my hands. In like manner . . . by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we are said to communicate, or to be made partakers of the body of Christ which was broken, and of His blood which was shed for us, that is, of the real benefits of His death and passion."[1]

The purpose of approaching the Lord's Table is "to commemorate His death and to renew our covenant with Him to live as becomes the Gospel."[2] The idea of commemoration he expands elsewhere:

> "This is the proper end of the blessed Sacrament . . . to represent to our minds the incarnation and passion of our dear Lord, by the symbols of His body broken and by His blood shed for us. . . . Whenever we see His blood poured forth and His body broken for us, so moving a sight should raise strange passions in us, of love to our Saviour, and hatred to our sins, and should inspire us with mighty resolutions of service and obedience to Him; and whenever the pledges and seals of these benefits are delivered into our hands, the sight of them should at once wound and revive our hearts, and make us cry out, 'Lord, how unworthy I am, for whom Thou shouldest do and suffer all this! I am overcome by Thy love, and can no longer hold out against the mighty force of such kindness! I render myself to Thee and will serve Thee for ever.'"[3]

The idea also of renewing our covenant is dwelt upon again more fully; after referring to the new covenant in His blood, he continued, "That this was always understood to be the meaning of this holy Sacrament, to renew our covenant with God and solemnly to confirm our resolutions of a holy life, is very plain from that account which Pliny gives us of the worship of the Christians" who bound themselves by a sacrament or oath not to do evil.[4]

Our Lord gave us in the Holy Communion "one of the most natural and delightful actions" as a memorial,[5] for which we should "have a very high value and esteem," and in which we ought frequently to participate.[1] For, as he said in a discourse to his servants:

---

[1] *Works*, ii. 413 f. [2] ii. 404. [3] iv. 566 f. [4] i. 494 f. [5] ii. 382.

> "Both the comfort and the benefit of it are great; the comfort of it, because it does not only represent to us the exceeding love of Our Saviour, in giving His body to be broken and His blood to be shed for us, but it likewise seals to us all those blessings and benefits which are purchased and procured for us by His death and passion, the pardon of sins and power against sin. The benefit of it is also great, because hereby we are confirmed in goodness, and our resolutions of better obedience are strengthened, and the grace of God's Holy Spirit to enable us to do His Will is hereby conveyed to us."[2]

Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715), Bishop of Salisbury, the historian, wrote his famous *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, which appeared in 1699. After discussing the words of institution, he remarks, "We conclude that we are in the right to understand the whole period in a mystical and figurative sense";[3] and he showed that Transubstantiation was contrary to patristic teaching.[4]

He doubted the advisability of using the phrase "real presence," which the first Reformers had rejected:

> "We acknowledge a real presence of Christ in the Sacrament; though we are convinced that our first Reformers judged right, concerning the use of the phrase 'real presence,' that it were better to be let fall than to be continued, since the use of it, and that idea which does naturally arise from the common acceptation of it, may stick deeper, and feed superstition more, than all those larger explanations that are given to it can be able to cure. But howsoever in this sense it is innocent of itself, and may be lawfully used; though perhaps it were more cautiously done not to use it, since advantages have been taken from it to urge it further than we intend it; and since it has been a snare to some."[5]

In the two following passages he shows clearly that the real presence refers to the crucified body, although, like earlier writers, without attempting to overcome the antinomy created by the spiritual presence of that which was originally physical. The Church of England rejects Consubstantiation together with the theory that the body and blood of Christ are in, with and under the bread and wine:

---

[1] *Works*, ii. 404. [2] x. 211. [3] Pp. 406 f. [4] Pp. 424 ff. [5] P. 415.

> "We assert a real presence of the body and blood of Christ; but not of His body as it is now glorified in heaven, but of His body as it was broken on the Cross, when His blood was shed and separated from it; that is, His death, with the merit and effects of it, are in a visible and federal act offered in this Sacrament to all worthy believers."[1]
>
> "The Lutherans believe a consubstantiation and that both Christ's body and blood, and the substance of the elements, are together in the Sacrament. That some explain by an ubiquity, which they think is communicated to the human nature of Christ, by which His body is everywhere as well as in the Sacrament: whereas others of them think that since the words of Christ must needs be true in a literal sense, His body and blood is therefore in the Sacrament, but in, with and under the bread and wine. All this we think is ill grounded, and is neither agreeable to the words of the institution, nor to the nature of things."[2]

He definitely affirms that the wicked do not receive Christ's body and blood:

> "This article[3] arises naturally out of the former and depends upon it; for, if Christ's body is corporally present in the Sacrament, then all persons, good or bad, who receive the Sacrament, do also receive Christ: on the other hand, if Christ is present only in a spiritual manner, and if the mean that receives Christ is faith, then such as believe not, do not receive Him. So that to prove that the wicked do not receive Christ's body and blood, is upon the matter the same thing with the proving that He is not corporally present. And it is a very considerable branch of our argument, by which we prove that the fathers did not believe the corporal presence, because they do very often say, that the wicked do not receive Christ in the Sacrament. . . . And as it is confessed on all hands, that the inward and spiritual effects of the Sacrament

---

[1] P. 414 f. [2] P. 444. [3] xxix.

> depend upon the state and disposition of him that communicates, so we who own no other presence but an inward and spiritual one, cannot conceive that the wicked who believe not in Christ, do receive Him."[1]

He condemns the adoration of the elements, a practice which results from the doctrine of Transubstantiation or of Consubstantiation.[2]

Benjamin Hoadly (1676–1761), Bishop in succession of Bangor, Hereford, Salisbury and Winchester, issued in 1735 anonymously a treatise entitled *A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,* in which it is explained as a commemorative rite. His purpose was to relieve the perplexity of some of the best and most sincere Christians, whom he had often found in danger of great errors or superstition, or in uneasiness which he traced to the accounts given in many books of devotion.[3] He wished to explain simply the meaning of the Lord's Supper, and therefore confined himself to the references in the New Testament.[4]

Our Lord's discourse in S. John vi. does not refer to the Lord's Supper, nor was it so interpreted in the very first days of the Church. But "many have laboured much" to interpret it of the Sacrament, "especially since the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation and other dark and unintelligible notions have been brought into this subject."[5] After noting the differences in the records of the institution, he says:

> "It is evident that the apostles and evangelists, even in giving an account of an institution, which depended entirely upon Our Lord's own declarations, and was to be a standing rite in the Christian Church, were not superstitiously scrupulous in numbering His words; nay nor solicitous to relate the very words, and those only, which He made use of. Some record fewer words, and some more; and all plainly think it sufficient to represent exactly the intent of the whole."[6] . . . "The whole tenor and form of this institution is in the figurative way of speaking."[7]

The end of the Lord's Supper was the remembrance of

---

[1] P. 450 f.
[2] P. 445 f.
[3] Pp. 843, 847.
[4] P. 847 f.
[5] P. 875.
[6] P. 849.
[7] P. 850.

Our Lord; and it is the neglect of this simple primary idea that has led to error and absurdity.[1] "The doing any act, in remembrance of a person implies his bodily absence."[2] The bread and wine are not to be taken "as the things themselves in remembrance of which they were ordained to be received."[3] They do "not operate as a charm."[4] "The great design of this institution is to call to remembrance the death of Christ and what is implied in this, to commemorate the benefits accruing to Christians from it"; but he went on to say, "the promise of Christ's being in the midst of us is not peculiar to our attendance upon this rite; but, as far as it relates to Christians of later ages, it belongs to our assembling in His name, or as His disciples, upon this, or upon any other religious account."[5]

The *Plain Account* created a great stir; and Hoadly, as the aggressive leader of the Latitudinarians and a brilliant controversialist, became the object for attack. A vigorous literary controversy ensued; pamphlets, some of which were anonymous, appeared for and against the treatise. On the one side it was claimed that its doctrine was in accordance with Scripture;[6] and its usefulness and expediency were urged in view of the teaching in certain devotional books that were widely current, such as Horneck's *The Crucified Jesus*, with its language of intense fervour, and *A Week's Preparation towards a worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper*, which laid great emphasis on the need of preparation "terrifying well-disposed minds with strange sorts of doubts and scruples";[7] and it would help to discourage "the absurd doctrine of a true and real presence."[8] On the other side, theologians of the Non-juring School (Dr. Brett and William Law) and others, strongly condemned Hoadly's book as teaching inadequate doctrine; but an important result of the controversy was the valuable contribution by Dr. Waterland, who had already written against a book expressing a similar view to Hoadly's, by Dr. Samuel Clarke.

Here may be mentioned the devotional manual, which subsequently appeared, entitled *The New Week's Preparation*

---

[1] Pp. 854, 894. [2] P. 852. [3] P. 854. [4] P. 892. [5] P. 893.

[6] *A Vindication of "A Plain Account,"* p. 34 (1735). [7] *Ibid.*

[8] *An Apologetical Defence*, p. 25 (1735).

for a worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper. It was published anonymously, and the preface states that it was intended to supersede *A Week's Preparation.* It gradually succeeded in doing so, for it went through a very large number of editions, being widely used in the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth centuries. Its tone was sober and earnest, and its teaching can be seen from the following passage:

> "The doing any act in remembrance of a person implies his bodily absence; and we are never said, nor can we be said to perform that action in order, if he be corporally present, to remember him. . . . The real presence maintained by Protestants is not the presence of Christ's natural body, but the real presence of Christ's invisible power and grace so in and with the elements of bread and wine as to convey spiritual and real effects to the souls of such as duly receive them."

HANOVERIAN MODERATES.

William Wake (1657–1737), who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1716, had not only a wide knowledge of the works of English divines, but also a considerable acquaintance with contemporary continental writers. In the reign of James II. he had written *A Discourse on the Holy Eucharist* in reply to the Romanist, Abraham Woodhead, who had tried to show that theologians of the Church of England had, while rejecting Transubstantiation, held a doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament and of the adoration of them as there present, that was closely akin to it. He also put forth later *The Principles of the Christian Religion, explained in a brief Commentary upon the Church Catechism*, which went through several editions.

In the *Discourse* he dealt with various theories of the Holy Communion. He was confident, making allowance for some exaggerated expressions, that our divines did not hold the views alleged by Woodhead; and after examining the quotations of the latter from Andrewes, Laud, Taylor, Thorndike, etc., he sums up:

> "Thus have I considered the several divines produced for this new conceit concerning the real presence, and shown the greatest part of his authors to be evidently

> against it; some not to have spoken so clearly that we can determine anything concerning them, but not one that favours what they were alleged for."[1]

He draws attention to the different interpretations of Zwinglianism:

> "'If this be all the Church of England understands, when it speaks of a real presence, viz., a real sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy signs, and a real spiritual presence in the inward communication of them to the soul of every worthy receiver, will not this precipitate us into downright Zuinglianism, and render us after all our pretences as very Sacramentarians as they'? Indeed, I am not able directly to say whether it will or not, because I find the opinion of Zuinglius very variously represented as to this matter. But yet first, if by Zuinglianism he means that which is more properly Socinianism, viz., a mere commemoration of Christ's death and a thanksgiving to God for it, it is evident it does not, for as much as we positively confess that in this holy Sacrament there is a real and spiritual grace communicated to us, even all the benefits of that death and passion which we there set forth. And this, or something very like it, I find sometimes to have been maintained by Zuinglius. But now, secondly, if by Zuinglianism he understands such a real presence as denies only the co-existence of Christ's natural body now in heaven, at the same time in this holy Sacrament, but denies nothing of that real and spiritual communion of it we have before mentioned; this is indeed our doctrine, nor shall we be ashamed to own it for any ill names he is able to put upon it. But yet I wonder why he should call this Zuinglianism, since if the common name of Catholic, or Christian doctrine, be not sufficient, he might have found out a more ancient abettor of this real presence than Zuinglius."[2]

In his criticism of Transubstantiation, he starts out with its definition by the Council of Trent, shows that it is contrary to the best and purest tradition of the Church, as well as to reason and common sense; indeed if Roman Catholics could only understand "a doctrine so absurd that even their credulity could hardly be able to digest it."[3]

[1] Gibson, x. 76. [2] *Ibid.* x. 84 f. [3] *Ibid.* x. 32.

Our Lord's words are to be understood figuratively; indeed, if taken literally, "it is the cup that is transubstantiated, not the wine."[1] Writing of the true notion of the spiritual presence, as acknowledged by the Church of England, he says:

> "We deny that in the sacred elements which we receive, there is any other substance than that of bread and wine, distributed to the communicants, which alone they take into their mouths and press with their teeth. In short, all which the doctrine of our Church implies by this phrase is only a real presence of Christ's invisible power and grace, so in and with the elements, as by the faithful receiving of them, to convey spiritual and real effects to the souls of men . . . the bread and wine after consecration are the real, but the spiritual and mystical body of Christ."[2]

He quotes from "the venerable Mr. Hooker . . . whose judgment, having been so deservedly esteemed by all sorts of men, ought not to be lightly accounted of by us," the statement that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament,"[3] and he gives the familiar illustration of a son receiving from his father a roll of parchment with a seal tied to it entitling him to his estate.[4]

His doctrinal attitude is illustrated by two further points. He argues at length against the adoration of the host: "Neither do the genuine sons of the Church of England, nor any other that I know of, either believe Christ's natural body to be substantially present in the Holy Eucharist or to be adored there. I am sure if there be any such, they cannot be the genuine sons of the Church of England in this matter."[5] And in another work, *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, he again deals with the subject:

> "It is certain that neither Christ nor His Apostles appointed or practised, nor the Church for above a thousand years required or taught any adoration of this holy Sacrament. . . . The bell (A.D. 1240), the Feast of S. Sacrament (A.D. 1264), the pomp of carrying it through

---

[1] *Gibson*, x. 36. [2] *Ibid*. x. 55. [3] *Ibid*. x. 68.
[4] *Ibid*. x. 85 f. [5] *Ibid*. x. p. 107.

the streets (thirteenth century), all the other circumstances of this worship are inventions of yesterday.[1] The exposing of it upon the altar to make their prayers before it; their addresses to it in times and cases of necessity, their performing the chiefest acts of religion in its presence, never mentioned in antiquity."[2]

Writing of those who believe in Transubstantiation, he says:

> "By supposing Christ's glorified body to be that which we receive in this Sacrament, they utterly destroy the very nature of it. It was the design of this Sacrament to exhibit and communicate to us the body and blood of Christ, not any way, but in the state of His suffering, as He was given for us and became a sacrifice for our sins . . . so that if the body and blood of Christ be in this Sacrament, it must be not that which He now has in Heaven, but that which He then had, when He suffered for us upon earth."[3]

Daniel Waterland (1683–1740), at one time Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, and afterwards Archdeacon of Middlesex, published in 1737 his famous book, entitled *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist.* Though it does not give the impression of being primarily a controversial work, yet it refuted Hoadly on the one side, and Johnson and Brett on the other. He shows a wide and deep knowledge not only of the Fathers but of the writings of Roman Catholics and of the English and foreign Reformers; and his work is characterised by conspicuous fairness, thoroughness and acuteness. In the volume are contained four charges to the clergy of Middlesex on the same subject. He was strongly opposed to Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation and Zwinglianism, and also, as it is agreed,[4] denied any presence of Christ in the elements. His own doctrine is similar to that of Cranmer.

Commenting on S. John vi. he says, it is necessary to distinguish between interpretation and application. It may properly be applied to the Eucharist when the elements are worthily received, but the chapter is to be interpreted in a wider sense, for "eating the flesh and drinking the blood" have the general meaning of feeding upon the death and passion of Christ, i.e. of receiving the benefits of His death, the spiritual food of pardon and grace coming down from above, whether in the Sacraments or otherwise. During the first four centuries the Fathers did not interpret this chapter directly of the Eucharist, though many of them applied it so. But afterwards confusion arose, because of that frequent application; and in time many, especially among the Latins, came to interpret it directly of the Eucharist. This was rejected by the Reformers; and though Romanists generally interpret it of the Eucharist, they are thereby involved in difficulties, for the words, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," so understood, make for infant communion, and are opposed to the denial of the cup to the laity.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* Macdonald, *Berengar*, pp. 221 ff.

[2] Gibson, xii. 124.

[3] *The Principles of the Christian Religion, Sec.* xlix.

[4] Gore, pp. 50 ff.

The consecration of the elements means that being "sanctified by the word of God and prayer,"[2] they thereby contract a relative holiness on account of their relation to what they represent or point to, by Divine institution. Other illustrations of relative holiness in varying degrees are to be found in the divisions of the Jewish Temple or a throne or a crown. A holy or sacred relation is conveyed to them by their appropriation and use. It is the work of the Holy Spirit to render the elements relatively holy, to change them from common to sacred; but there is no change in their inward qualities, for the idea of an inherent, intrinsic holiness in the elements is not in accordance with true philosophy or sound theology. And he insists again and again that the change of the elements by consecration is similar to the change of the water in Baptism.[3]

Waterland devotes considerable space to the subject of the invocation and illapse of the Holy Spirit on the elements, a question which had become prominent in the early part of the eighteenth century, through the importance attached to it by Johnson and the Nonjurors. In common speech, when any one prays that God may bless the means used for a person's recovery, the clear meaning is that God may bless him and give him success in the use of those means. So in Baptism, when prayer is offered that the Holy Spirit

[1] Pp. 101 ff.

[2] 1 Tim. iv. 5.

[3] Pp. 90 ff., 500 f., 541 ff.

will sanctify the waters, it is that the person should receive the grace of the Holy Spirit in the use of that water.[1] Further, "the ancients supposed the like illapse of the Spirit, and the like change wrought in the waters of Baptism, and in the oil and chrism, etc., as in the elements of the Eucharist."[2] Each has a relative holiness. Writing of Basil, he added, "Had the Romanists been as careful to distinguish in the matter of the Eucharist, as Basil here was with respect to Baptism, they would have seen no more reason for adoration of the host then Basil could find for adoration of water."[3]

It is, however, true that the Fathers did not always carefully distinguish between the sanctification of the communicant and the consecration of the elements. There is considerable difference between saying that the Holy Spirit sanctifies the receiver in the use of the outward symbols and saying that the Holy Spirit sanctifies the symbols to their use. The former is more intelligible, and for the latter there is no proof. He considered that Hooker's judicious statement of the spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament is equally applicable to the presence of the Holy Spirit: "It is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."[4] He sums up his argument in these words:

> "It is very plain from all liturgies, and from all kinds of ancient testimonies, that the Christian world has all along believed, that the Spirit of God is invisibly present, and operates effectually in both Sacraments: as well to confer a relative holiness upon the outward symbols as to convey the grace of sanctification to the faithful recipients."[5]

Waterland points out that the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI included a prayer for the illapse of the Holy Spirit both in Baptism and the Holy Communion. It was, however, afterwards omitted "upon prudential considerations," probably because we have no express Scriptural precept for it, nor can it be traced earlier than the fourth century; it was liable to misconstruction; and in the words, "Grant that we receiving these, Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His most precious body and blood," the operation of the Holy Spirit is implied, though not stated:

---

[1] P. 287. [2] P. 299. [3] P. 284. [4] Pp. 93 f. [5] P. 304 f.

> "After all, I see no reason why it may not be justly thought as modest and as reverent to beg of God the Father the things which we want, understanding that He will grant them by His Holy Spirit, as to make a formal petition to Him, to send His Holy Spirit upon the elements or upon the communicants; unless Scripture had particularly ordered some such special form, to be made use of in our sacramental solemnities, which it has not done."[1]

On the symbolism of the bread and wine, he says that the famous passage of S. Bernard[2] gives a good general idea of the symbolical nature of the Sacraments, when he compares them with the instruments of investiture (e.g. a book, ring, crozier, etc.) into lands, honours and dignities; such instruments are emblematical of what they belong to and are at the same time means of conveyance. So with the bread and wine, "they are, after consecration, called by the names of what they are pledges of, and are ordained to convey . . . while they are made use of in the holy service, they are considered, construed, understood . . . as standing for what they represent and exhibit." Similarly, a deed of conveyance is not a real estate, but it conveys one, and it is in effect the estate itself.

But he criticises the statement that the bread and wine are the body and blood "in power and effect, or in virtue and energy," as

> "it seems to carry in it some obscure conception either of an inherent or infused virtue resting upon the bare elements, and operating as a mean, which is not the truth of the case. . . . The symbols are not the body in power and effect, if those words mean efficiency; but, suitable disposition supposed in the recipient, the delivery of these symbols is, in construction of Gospel law, and in Divine intention, and therefore in certain effect or consequence, a delivery of the things signified."[3]

He concludes:

> "The sum of all is, that sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body broken and blood shed, under the signs and symbols of bread

---

[1] Pp. 300 ff. [2] *Sermon, De Coen. Domini.* [3] Pp. 146 ff.

> and wine; the result of such feeding is the strengthening or perfecting our mystical union with the body glorified; and so, properly speaking, we feed upon the body as dead and we receive it into closer union as living and both in the Eucharist when duly celebrated."[1]

His teaching, Waterland claims, is not only consonant with Scripture, but was the doctrine of all the Christian Churches for more than six centuries. But

> "in the declension of the seventh century some began to speak very oddly of the elements as being literally made, by consecration, the very body and blood of Christ, not images or antitypes at all, as used to be taught aforetime. From thence we may reasonably date all the confusion and perplexity which has since so clouded and embarrassed the theory of this Sacrament."[2]

He specially blamed the erroneous influence of John Damascene in the eighth century; but it was from the change of doctrine introduced in the seventh century that gradually there

> "came augmentation, assumption, impanation, composition, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, local presence, and oral manducation of the *res sacramenti*, inherent virtues, bread-sacrifice, bread-worship and the like; all issuing from the same source . . . the mistaking signs for things and figure for verity."[3]

At the Reformation it was difficult to clear off all the thick darkness that had gathered round the doctrine of the Eucharist in "the dark ages": so neither Luther nor Zwingli "did it to such perfection as might have been wished." Luther "threw off transubstantiation very justly, but yet retained I know not what corporal, local presence, and therefore did not retrench enough." Zwingli "threw off all corporal and local presence very rightly, but threw off withal (or too much neglected) the spiritual presence and spiritual graces, which was retrenching a great deal too much." It may be, however, that he was misunderstood, for his followers, at any rate, "came into the old and true notion of spiritual benefits." Calvin improved upon Zwingli and was right in the main. But his teaching was confused, for he did not distinguish clearly between the crucified body as eaten by, and the glorified body as united to the Christian. The English Reformers profited by these mistakes, and had the right thought on the subject, with the exception of Bishop Poynet, but Waterland's criticism of this writer is needless because he was not the author of the work attributed to him, and indeed held a doctrine that coincided with Cranmer's.[1] Waterland commended the belief of the judicious Cranmer, and regarded it as expressing also in the main the doctrine of Ridley, Latimer and Jewel.[2]

---

[1] P. 191. [2] P. 544. [3] P. 564 f.

The divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries expressed themselves in a variety of ways concerning the Holy Communion, but were in general agreement as regards their main position. However rhetorical may have been the language of some, and though some hesitated to define the nature of the real presence, there was a general recognition of a chasm which separated the Reformed doctrine from Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, or, as Archbishop Wake showed, any theory approximating to them. The profound dislike of Transubstantiation is very apparent during the whole period; and though there was less interest in Consubstantiation, again and again it is repudiated; and such men as Laud and Cosin looked back to the English Reformers as their teachers. It is true that ambiguous and unguarded expressions are to be found, but there are also in the same writers crucial statements which determine their real mind. The main conclusion is this: the only doctrines held by the representative divines, whose works have been considered, were Receptionist, Virtualist and Memorialist. The majority were Receptionists; the Virtualists included Jackson, Johnson, Wilson; while Hales, Tillotson and Hoadly represented the Memorialist view. Field, it is true, may stand on the edge of the Reformed side; but Laud and Thorndike form possible exceptions to the general attitude, but, as has been seen, even so, the Protestant aspects of Thorndike's doctrine cannot be ignored, and anyhow he cannot be regarded as representative of the doctrine of the Church of England.

Several theologians, such as Andrewes, Laud and Bramhall, repudiated what they called Zwinglianism, by which they appear to have meant, as Laud put it, "a bare sign

[1] Goode, p. 967.

[2] Pp. 181 ff., 567 ff.

taken in remembrance of Christ's passion." But, as Archbishop Wake pointed out, Zwinglianism is used in more than one sense[1]; if that be so, it is hardly correct to apply the term of "mere Zwinglian" to such a belief as that held by Tillotson or Hoadly, who dwelt upon the spiritual benefits which result from participation in the Sacrament, though the latter rightly said that "the promise of Christ's being in the midst of us is not peculiar to the Holy Communion."

Other notable divines contributed to the intellectual greatness of the eighteenth century, but their works were occupied with the controversies of the time. Waterland's work was epoch-making and at once took its place as the classic on the subject of the Holy Communion. Indeed so great was its repute that about a hundred and thirty years later it was reissued (1868) at the request of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, with a preface written by Bishop Jackson of Lincoln (afterwards of London), who described it as "a treatise which was once considered almost as the text-book of the Church of England on the subject of the Eucharist, but which . . . is far less known at present than it deserves," and commended it as "a safe and perspicuous guide to those tenets on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which, as a matter of fact, have been held by the great majority of the ablest and most learned theologians of the Reformed Church of England."[2]

SYNOPSIS OF THE CAROLINE v. HANOVERIAN DIVINES.

1. THE LAUDIAN SCHOOL. Andrewes, Buckeridge, Sutton, Laud, Mountague, Jackson, Herbert, Hammond, Bramhall, Cosin, Taylor, Thorndike.
2. THE PURITAN SCHOOL. Crakanthorp, Bayly.
3. CAROLINE MODERATES. Field, Rogers, Morton, Hall, Ussher.
4. EARLY LATITUDINARIAN DOCTRINE. Hales.
5. BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. Canons (1640).
6. THE NONJURING SCHOOL. Johnson, The Nonjurors, Ken.
7. THE HIGH CHURCH SCHOOL. Bull, Beveridge, Aldrich, Wilson.
8. THE LATITUDINARIAN SCHOOL. Tillotson, Burnet, Hoadly.
9. HANOVERIAN MODERATES. Wake, Waterland.

---

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 169.

[2] Another edition was issued at Oxford in 1896.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

ALDRICH, H. *A Reply to Two Discourses* (1687).

ANDREWES, L. *Ninety-six Sermons*, Vols. 1–5 (1841–3). *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* (1851). *Opuscula quaedam posthuma* (1852). *Minor Works* (1854).

Animadversions by way of answer to a sermon preached by Dr. Thomas Kenne (1687).

BAYLY, L. *Practice of Piety* (1842).

BEVERIDGE, W. *Works* (1842–8).

BRAMHALL, J. *Works* (1842–5). Vol. I. *An answer to M. de la Milletière*. Vol. II. *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*. Vol. III. *Consecration of Protestant Bishops vindicated*. Vol. IV. *An answer to two papers*.

BRETT, T. *Discourse concerning the necessity of discerning the Lord's body in the Holy Communion* (1720).

BUCKERIDGE, J. *Discourse concerning kneeling at the Communion* (1618).

BULL, G. *Works* (revised by E. Burton) (1827).

BURNET, G. *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles* (1841).

COSIN, J. *Works*, Vol. IV. (1851). *Historia Transubstantiationis Papalis* with *E.T. Concerning the Ordination of Priests in the Church of England. Regni Angliae religio Catholica.* Vol. V. (1855) *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*.

CRAKANTHORP, R. *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (1847).

DIMOCK, N. *Notes on the Round Table Conference, Fulham, 1900* (1911). *Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence* (1911).

FIELD, R. *Of the Church* (1847–1852).

FORBES, A. P. *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (1881).

GIBSON, E. *Preservative against Popery* (1848–9).

GOODE, W. *The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist* (1856).

GORE, C. *The Body of Christ* (1902).

HALES, J. *Works*, Vol. I. (1765).

HALL, J. *Works* (1837–9).

HAMMOND, H. *A Practical Catechism* (1847).

HOADLY, B. *Works*, Vol. III. (1773).

JACKSON, T. *Works* (1844).

JOHNSON, J. *Theological Works* (1847).

KEN, T. *Prose Works* (1838).

LAUD, W. *Works* (1847–60).

MOBERLY, R. C. *Journal of Theological Studies* (1901).

MORTON, T. *A Catholic Appeal for Protestants* (1610). *Of the Institution of the Sacrament* (1631).

MOUNTAGUE, R. *A Gagg for the New Gospell? No, a new gagg for an old goose* (1624). *Appello Caesarem* (1625).

ROGERS, T. *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England, an Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles* (1854). (The title in the 1607 ed. being *The faith, doctrine, and religion, professed and protected in the realm of England and Dominions of the same, expressed in 39 articles.*)

STONE, DARWELL. *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (1909).
SUTTON, C. *Godly Meditations upon the most holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (1866).
TAYLOR, J. *Works* (revised by C. P. Eden), Vol. VI. (1862).
THORNDIKE, H. *Works* (1844–56).
TILLOTSON, J. *Works* (1820).
TOMLINSON, J. T. *Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies* (1897).
USSHER, J. *Works* (1847–64).
WAKE, W. *The Principles of the Christian Religion, explained in a brief commentary upon the Church Catechism* (1832).
WATERLAND, D. *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1896).
WILBERFORCE, R. I. *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (1853).
WILSON, T. *Works* (1847–63).

VIII. FREE CHURCH INTERPRETATION.

REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT DAY.

By A. H. W. Harrison.

The beginnings of present-day Nonconformity should be traced to the reign of Elizabeth rather than to 1662, when all possibility of unity in the religious life of the nation seemed to pass finally out of sight. There is still a difference of opinion as to the exact date when the term Puritan came into use in England, but Puritanism was certainly in existence when Elizabeth came to the throne.[1] Since the great upheaval caused by the breach with Rome had left the greatest disorder in the Church, and the reign of Mary had been too short to secure even the appearance of uniformity, it is not surprising that great differences in the conduct of worship and in the observance of the Sacraments were seen in the early years of Elizabeth. Indeed it was very difficult to secure uniformity of procedure during the whole of the reign, and the Puritan school endeavoured by all means in their power to avoid the appearance of a priest offering sacrifice in the holy service. They were encouraged in this attitude by many continental reformers.[2]

On the death of Grindal (1583) an opportunity was seized to appoint as his successor a strong man who should reduce the Puritans to order, and secure uniformity at last. Whitgift, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1583 to 1604, was the man for the task. He found in Cartwright the chief protagonist of the Puritanism that was seeking to presbyterianise the Church of England; and while Hooker was dealing with Travers in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Whitgift was silencing and suppressing the extreme Puritans and separatists by his administration, and was answering the arguments of Cartwright in his writings.

Although Cartwright was expelled from his Regius Professorship and more than once driven into exile, he had no desire to break with the national Church, and was found in her communion at his death. Yet he must share with Robert Browne (the first of the Independents) the credit or discredit of being the creative force in Elizabethan nonconformity. Browne also conformed to the Established Church, and died as Rector of Achurch-cum-Thorpe in Northamptonshire.

---

[1] *Cf.* Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* ix. 1 ; 66, 67.

[2] *Cf.* Bullinger, *Zurich Letters*, p. 164. (Parker Society, 1842.)

If we keep to chronological order we shall turn to Cartwright first in our study of the views of the advanced Reformers on the subject of the Lord's Supper. In the interpretation of the words of Christ at the institution of the Supper there is probably no difference between Whitgift and Cartwright; yet they find differences in the order of service and in procedure enough to fill several pages of controversy in Whitgift's *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition.* Cartwright would depart as far as possible from the Roman *Missal* and could find no place for introit, epistle and gospel, nor for the Nicene Creed in the Communion Service. He stresses also the need for the examination of candidates for Communion, which he declared to be the practice of the early Church. Whitgift presses him to produce some proof of this from the New Testament,[1] and condemns the doctrine which Hooker rejected in his controversy with Travers, that no ceremony was lawful in the Church that was not found in Scripture. Since this was the canon that held sway with these early Presbyterians we naturally find a movement towards simplification of the office, although there was at that time no attempt to abolish the liturgical form altogether. Cartwright also objected to the use of wafer-cakes like the Romish "God of the altar"; to the reception of the elements kneeling, after the decree of Honorius III, rather than sitting as the Apostles did, and thus avoiding the risk of adoration.[2] Whitgift will not be ruled by this slavish regard for precedent in the New Testament. "You might as well have said," he replies, "they received after supper; we before dinner; they at night; we in the morning: they after meat; we before meat; they in a private house; we in the open church: they being all men, and in number twelve; we together with women, not strictly observing the number of twelve, or any other number above three or four." If Cartwright has not hitherto had the better of the argument he certainly comes nearer some success when he objects to the Communion Service being made a test of loyalty applied by the State. The early Church "shut men by reason of their sins (I Cor. v. II) from the Lord's Supper: we thrust them in their sin to the Lord's Supper."[1] Whitgift has some difficulty in meeting this criticism, but shews himself more ready of reply to the final thrust; the Apostles "ministered the Sacraments plainly; we pompously, with singing, piping, surplice and cope-wearing."[2] These Puritans disliked the surplice and the cope, yet they would not allow the Sacraments to be administered by unordained persons or in private houses; it was of the essence of the Sacrament that it should be administered by a minister, and it should *always* be accompanied with preaching.

---

[1] Whitgift, *Works,* iii. 79.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 82–96.

The same arguments, with many more against Transubstantiation, are to be found in Cartwright's *Confutation of the Rheimists Translation*. The full title of this powerful attack on the Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament, with annotations published at Reims, is extended to a dozen lines, and indicates at once the vigour with which Cartwright attacks the "blasphemous fable of the Mass.' We are not disappointed when we turn to his comments on Matt. xxvi, John vi and I Cor. xi. He supports of course the figurative interpretations of the words of institution, for "unless it have this figurative understanding, there must bee two Christs in the Supper, one breaking another broken, one eating and another eaten." He is particularly severe on the doctrine that the Christian ministry is a sacrificing priesthood. We are not told to "*sacrifice* this," but "*do* this in remembrance of me"; not "as oft as ye shall *sacrifice* this bread and this cuppe," but "*eat* this bread and *drink* this cup ye shew forth the Lord's death until he come." "They cannot find so much as one syllable in this scripture either of sacrifice or of altar or priesthood."[3] Yet he is so moderate as to say, "Whether it be leavened or unleavened bread, we will not strive but take that which the Church shall according to the time and persons ordaine. Howbeit this we dare boldly say that in the use of leavened bread we come nearer to the imitation of Christ's action than those which take unleavened."[1] The Sacrament is necessary since it is at once a "lively representation" of the death of Christ and a seal and pledge of the forgiveness of our sins.[2]

---

[1] Whitgift, *Works*, iii. 101. [2] *Ibid.* p. 106. [3] *Confutation* (*in loc*).

The clearest expression of the difference between these Puritans with Presbyterian tendencies and those who favoured the Elizabethan settlement of religion is to be found in their Book of Common Prayer. Puritanism was specially strong in the burgher and merchant classes, and the trade with Germany and the Low Countries brought many English traders under the influence of the Reformed Churches of the Continent. It is not surprising, therefore, that the English factories and settlements in Holland should be centres of Puritanism even before Holland became a place of exile for Nonconformists who had to flee from the strict oversight of Elizabeth and James I. Middelburgh was one of the most important of these depôts, and it was at Middelburgh in 1586 that the first Puritan Book of Common Prayer was issued. The long creed, the confession of sins and the prayers before the sermon are interesting expressions of a Puritanism based upon the Bible alone. Opportunity is also given for extempore prayer. "The day when the Lordes Supper shall be ministered which shall be commonly once a moneth or so ofte as the Congregation shall thinke expedient, the Minister shall use to say as followeth. Let us marke, deare brethren, and consider how Jesus Christ did ordain unto us his Holie Supper, according as S. Paule maketh rehearshall in the 11 Chap. of the firste Epistle to the Corint. saying:" then follows the reading of the account of the institution. The exhortation "dearly beloved in the Lord" is partly based on the Book of Common Prayer but specifies possible sins of the congregation in some detail, shewing some ingenuity and much quaint phraseology in endeavouring to cover the ground. The comfortable words and the prayer of humble access are alike omitted. In place of the former there is a meditation; "Let us consider, then, that the Sacrament is an excellent medicine for all poore sicke creatures, a comfortable helpe to weake soules," etc. The doctrine of Transubstantiation is here rejected "for the only way to dispose our soules to receive nourishment, releefe and quickening of his substance, is to lift uppe our mindes by faith above all things worldlie and sensible and thereby to enter into Heaven, that wee maye finde and receive Christe, where he dwelleth undoubtedlie verie God and verie man." The prayers of Humble Access and of Consecration are replaced by a thanksgiving for the blessings of creation and redemption:

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] *Confutation* (*in loc.*), Heb. v. 1.

> "At the commandement of Jesus Christ our Lorde we present ourselves at this his Table (which hee hath lefte to bee used in remembrounce of his death untill his comming again) to declare and witnesse before the world that by him alone we have received libertie and life.
>
> This done, the Minister comming to the Table, and the Table being furnished, is to break the breade and deliver it to the people, saying: Take and eate, this bread is the body of Christ that was broken for us, Doo this in remembrance of him: who distribute and divide the same among themselves, according to our Saviour Christ's commandement. Likewise he shall give the Cuppe, saying: Drinke ye all of this: This Cuppe is the newe Testament in the blood of Christ, which was shedde for the sins of manie: Doo this in the remembrance of him. During the which time, some place of the Scriptures is to bee read, which doeth lively set forth the death of Christe, to the intent that our eyes and senses may not onely be occupied in these outwarde signes of bread and wine, which are called the visible worde, but that our hearts and mindes also may be fullie fixed in the contemplation of the Lordes death, which is by this holy Sacrament represented."

The Sacrament was followed by a short prayer of thanksgiving and the singing of the 103rd Psalm or any other Psalm that might make an appropriate end to a true Eucharist: the blessing followed "and so they rise from the Table and departe." A note is added at the close of this form which is really an apology for the variations from the Book of Common Prayer:

> "If so be that any would marvell why we followe rather this order, than any other in the administration

> of this Sacrament, let him diligentlie consider, that first of all wee utterlie renounce the errour of the Papistes: secondlie, we restore unto the Sacrament his owne substance, and to Christ his proper place. And as for the words of the Lordes Supper, we rehearse them not because they should change the substance of the breade or wine, or that the repetition thereof with the intent of the sacrificer, should make the Sacrament (as Papistes falsely beleeve) but they are redde and pronounced to teache us howe to behave ourselves in that action, and that Christe might witnesse unto our fayth, as it were with his owne mouth, that he hath ordayned these signes for our spirituall use and comfort. We doo firste therefore examine ourselves according to Saint Paules rule, and prepare our mindes that we may be worthie partakers of so high mysteries. Then takinge breade, wee give thankes, breake and distribute it as Christe our Saviour hath taught us. Finallie, the ministration ended, we give thankes againe, accordinge to his example: so that without his worde and warrant, there is nothinge in this holy action attempted."[1]

The great interest of this alternative form of service for the use of English churchmen is that it is a compilation from Calvin's Genevan service-book. The influence of Calvin was destined to be of greater importance for Scotland than for England, yet the church at Middelburgh undoubtedly considered itself a part of the Church of England. Acts of Uniformity were destined to make such alternative forms of service impossible for the Established Church, but the ideals of Calvin's prayer book were followed in Presbyterianism and even among the Independents and Baptists. Calvin would have had a monthly celebration of the Lord's Supper but yielded to the recommendation of the Small Council at Geneva that it be held only four times a year.[2] The influence of Calvin's doctrine of the Sacrament is very marked in the Middelburgh prayerbook, especially in the passage about lifting up the mind by faith to enter into Heaven to receive Christ; yet it may be doubted how far the British Presbyterian and Independent followed Calvin in accepting the spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament, in the fulness of His personality (though in heaven) ready to vivify and nourish both body and soul of the believer.

---

[1] *A booke of the form of common prayers, administration of the Sacraments, etc., agreeable to God's Worde, and the use of the reformed Churches.* (1586).

[2] Barclay, *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, p. 159. Valeran Poulain who succeeded Calvin at Strassburg translated Calvin's Liturgy into Latin in 1545 and into English in 1552; *cf. Proceedings of Huguenot Society*, ix. 383.

The direct line of Calvin's influence is, however, best traced through the Scottish Church. In the 1560 "First Book of Discipline" it is definitely laid down that the Sacrament should be administered after the order of the Kirk of Geneva, and the *Confession of Faith* of the same year declares in its Article 21, "We utterlie damne the vanitie of they that affirme Sacramentes to be nathing ellis bot naked and baire signes. No we assuredlie beleeve that in the Supper richtlie used Christ Jesus is so joined with us that hee becummes very nurishment and fude of our soules." Here Calvin's *Catechism* is exactly followed, and in the following Article it is directed that the Sacrament is rightly administered only by lawful ministers. The Presbyterian mind reacts against many superstitious practices of Rome in the administration of the Sacraments, and attacks at length the use of oil and salt and spittle "and sic like." The adoration and reservation of the elements was also forbidden, especially the keeping of the bread in "boxes and buistes."

The authoritative statement of Presbyterian doctrine found its classical expression in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* of 1647, and it is here that we find the meeting place of the Scottish Churchmen and the English Nonconformists. Apart from questions of Church government and discipline, Independents and Presbyterians were at one on most matters of doctrine in the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Chapter xxvii on the Sacraments should therefore be given in full:

> "1. Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the Covenant of Grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits; and to confirm our Interest in him; as also to put a visible Difference between those that belong unto the Church, and the rest of the World;

> and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ according to his Word.
>
> 2. There is in every Sacrament a spiritual Relation or sacramental Union, between the Sign and the Thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the Names and Effects of the one are attributed to the other.
>
> 3. The Grace which is exhibited in or by the Sacraments rightly used, is not conferred by any Power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a Sacrament depend upon the Piety or Intention of him that doth administer it but upon the Work of the Spirit: and the Word of the Institution which contains, together with a Precept authorizing the Use thereof, a Promise of Benefit to worthy Receivers.
>
> 4. There be only Two Sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any, but by a Minister of the Word lawfully ordained."

It will be seen at once that there is no attempt to define the nature of the grace that is received in the Sacraments, but some further instruction is given on this subject in the following chapter which deals specifically with the Lord's Supper. "Our Lord Jesus," it declares,

> "in the night wherein he was betrayed instituted the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in his Church unto the End of the World; for the perpetual Remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing all Benefits thereof unto true Believers, their spiritual Nourishment and growth in him, their farther Engagement in and to all Duties which they owe unto him: and to be a Bond and Pledge of their communion with him and with each other as Members of his mystical Body."

Then follow sections which deny that the Sacrament is itself a sacrifice, and condemn private masses, worship of the elements, carrying them for adoration "or the reserving them for any pretended religious use." Transubstantiation is denied as contrary to Scripture and common sense; but while nothing but bread and wine is present in the Sacrament, "worthy receivers" do by faith "really and indeed yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually receive and feed upon Christ crucified and all Benefits of his Death." Wicked men on the contrary receive the elements but not the spiritual reality signified by them. Here is indeed the strongest denial of any *opus operatum* brought about by the words of consecration, but there is no attempt to relate the "spiritual reception" to any doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body, or to the elevation of the believer to the courts of heaven to a mystical fellowship with his Lord there.

While the *Westminster Confession* was destined to have a long and important history in Scotland, its influence in England was of short duration. In 1660 came the Restoration of the Stuarts, and the breach between the Established Church and the Nonconformists hardened into a permanent cleavage. The Conference between the Bishops and the Presbyterian divines to secure uniformity proved a failure.

Baxter is generally classed as a Presbyterian, but his exact position is hard to define. No man was more anxious than he to avoid the permanent division of English Christendom into two camps. He expressed a very high esteem for the Book of Common Prayer but desired to amend it by comparing it with old Liturgies and by securing some greater freedom than was permitted by it. Being challenged at the Conference to produce some alternative form of worship, he composed in an incredibly short space of time a new liturgy and book of service which is bound up with the original edition of the *Grand Debate*.[1] His order of celebrating the Sacrament begins with a long instruction which may or may not be used, at the discretion of the minister. The doctrinal part of this instruction is summarised as follows: "It being the renewing of a mutual Covenant that is here solemnized as we commemorate Christ's Sacrifice and receive him and his saving benefits, so we offer and deliver to him ourselves, as his redeemed, sanctified people, to be a living Acceptable Sacrifice, thankfully and obediently to live unto his Praise." The self-examination that follows must make it clear that only true penitents and believers are welcome at the Lord's Table. The exhortation and the prayer that follows are pleas to the mercy of God for forgiveness of sinners, with full confession of sin. Then follows the act of consecration, "here let the Bread be brought to the Minister, and received by him and set upon the Table, and then the Wine in like manner (or if they be set there before) however let him bless them, praying in these or the like words:

---

[1] *The Grand Debate between the Bishops, etc.* (1661), p. 17 f.

> "Almighty God, thou art the Creator, and the Lord of all things. Thou art the Sovereign Majesty whom we have offended. Thou art the most loving and merciful Father, who hast given thy Son to reconcile us to thyself. Who hast ratified the New Testament and covenant of Grace with his most precious blood; and hast instituted this holy Sacrament to be celebrated in remembrance of him till his coming. Sanctifie these thy creatures of Bread and Wine, which according to thy institution and command was set apart to this holy use, that they may be Sacramentally, The Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, Amen."[1]

The words of institution from 1 Cor. xi. 23–26 are then read, after which the minister declares that the Bread and Wine are no longer common bread and wine but "sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ." Another prayer for pardon, reconciliation, the quickening Spirit of God and nourishment "as thy members, to everlasting life" follows. "Then let the Minister take the bread and break it in the sight of the people saying, 'The body of Christ was broken for us, and offered once for all to sanctify us. Behold the sacrificed Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.' In like manner let him take the Cup and pour out the Wine in the sight of the Congregation saying, 'Wee were redeemed with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot.'" Here follows another prayer for the graces of thankfulness and obedience:

> "Then let the Minister deliver the Bread thus consecrated and broken to the Communicants, first taking and eating it himself as one of them when he hath said: 'Take yee, eat yee, This is the Body of Christ which is broken for you, Do this in remembrance of him.' In like manner he shall deliver them the Cup, first drinking of it himself, when he hath said 'This Cup is the New Testament in

---

[1] *A Petition for Peace with the Reformation of the Liturgy, etc.*, p. 53.

> Christ's Blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins, Drink ye all of it in remembrance of Him.'"[1]

It is unlikely that Baxter's reformed liturgy was ever used in the Presbyterian meeting-houses in England, though it may perhaps be regarded as a form of service for the Lord's Supper of a more elaborate type than was customary. The Independents turned away altogether from read prayers until they came to regard anything but extempore prayer as the denial of the spirit of worship. For this reason they were unable to take any part in the Savoy Conference when Baxter and others met the bishops to find a way of compromise in revising the Prayer Book. In Cromwell's attempt at comprehension in the Church he had merely succeeded in creating an organisation for preaching and teaching and left the real problems of Church government and administration unsolved. Even the mode of administering the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper were left as open questions. If the parish minister approved by the "Triers" were an Independent it is probable that the communicants would sit in pews for the memorial feast instead of gathering close round the table as the Presbyterians did. They were also accustomed to communicate week by week and disapproved of the infrequency of the quarterly service that prevailed in Presbyterian circles. They differed also from the Presbyterians in that they used no set forms and partook of the elements in silence; they also seemed to have had the strange custom of wearing their hats at the Lord's Supper. It was of course the Puritan custom to sit in church with their steeple crowned hats on, and to take them off only for the prayer, but it is something of a shock to find such a custom followed at Holy Communion. That strict Presbyterian, Principal Robert Baillie, had many complaints concerning the Independents at the Westminster Assembly of Divines. After complaining of their custom of receiving the Sacrament in pews he continues,

> "The Independents way of celebrating seems very irreverent. They have the communion every Sabbath, without any preparation before or thanksgiving after:

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 54.

> little examination of people: their very prayers and doctrine before the Sacrament use not to be directed to the use of the Sacrament. They have, after the blessing, a short discourse, and two short graces over the elements which are distributed and participate in silence, without exhortation, reading or singing, and all is ended with a psalm, without prayer. Mr. Nye told us his private judgment, that in preaching he thinks the minister should be covered and the people discovered; but in the Sacrament, the minister should be discovered as a servant, and the guests all covered."[1]

Differences in administration might seem to imply some real difference in doctrine but it is very difficult to discover any distinctive Independent or Presbyterian teaching which shows a clear cut line of division between them. Baillie and other Presbyterians were repelled by Independent liberties, yet Independent as well as Presbyterian could rise to high levels in his views of the special grace offered to penitent believers in the Sacrament. Both alike would deny the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but might accept the truth of the spiritual presence in their own way. It is not surprising to find Baxter with his fine devotional temper saying that the bodily senses are no judge whether Christ's spiritual body is present in the Supper or not. He follows this assertion by venturing into those realms of discussion concerning the ubiquity of the glorified body of our Lord which had such fascination for Lutheran and Calvinist theologians:

> "We conclude that Christ's body is not infinite or immense as is His Godhead; but what are its dimensions, limits or extent, and where it is absent, far be it from us to determine, when we cannot tell how far the sun extendeth, its secondary substance or emanant beams; nor well what locality is as to Christ's soul, or any spirit, if to a spiritual body."[2]

The Puritans regarded the Lord's Supper as an extension of the Word, but it was the Word of prophecy of which he was thinking rather than the Incarnate Word. The first object of this Sacrament with them was to continue the sermon and to turn the mind and heart of the congregation to the contemplation of the Cross of Christ. To some of them the Supper was far more than a mere commemorative meal, it was a representation of the Cross, and therefore the most vivid and powerful form of proclaiming their Gospel that they knew. The regular text for their sermons before the Supper might have been the words of S. Paul, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death until He come." Such is the teaching of Goodwin,[1] and such is the constant tenour of the *Sacramental Discourse of* Owen. Owen was one of the best of the Independents, a moderate and learned man who had been Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford under the Commonwealth. He was in turn Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Independent, and it was a grief to Baxter when they differed about the possibility of a reformed Prayer Book.[2] His sermons at the Lord's Supper were published from notes taken by Sir John Hartopp and did not appear until 1760, more than seventy years after Owen's death. He said that frequent celebrations may, indeed, be a hindrance rather than a help:

---

[1] R. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, Letter 45.

[2] Baxter's *Works*, xviii. 301.

> "Brethren, if we barely remember the love of Christ in the way of an ordinance, and our hearts be not powerfully affected with it, we are in danger of being disadvantaged by our attendance. Pray remember it; you know how plainly I use to speak on these occasions. I say, we have frequent opportunities of remembering the love of Christ in dying for us, in this ordinance representing of it: but if our hearts be not powerfully influenced and affected by it, we shall be losers by the frequency of ordinances."

Therefore the greatest need is for due spiritual preparation rather than any regularity of routine, or as he puts it in his own quaint and crabbed fashion: "Be sure to improve surprisals with gracious dispositions; I mean in the approach of solemn ordinances."[3]

His discourses at the Sacrament are often sermons on the Cross; sometimes they are intended for the spiritual preparation of the recipients, and occasionally they deal directly with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. When Owen expounds the significance of the Supper he regards it as fourfold. In the first place it is commemorative; then it is a form of preaching the death of Christ; then "it is peculiarly eucharistic"; and, lastly, it is "a federal ordinance" in which the New Testament is confirmed to the Church. It is in this last feature that the importance of the fellowship of saints appears, for "in the church we have all this treasure."[1] His repudiation of the Roman doctrine is adequate:

---

[1] Goodwin *Works* (1861–1866), vii. 311.

[2] *Cf.* Powicke, *Richard Baxter: Under the Cross*, p. 205 f.

[3] Owen, *Works*, ix. 555 f: 606 f.

> "When the world had lost an understanding of this mystery, for want of spiritual sight, they contrived a means to make it up that it should be easy on the part of them that did partake, and very prodigious on the part of them that administered. The priest, with a few words, turned the bread into the body of Christ: and the people have no more to do but to put it in their mouths, and so Christ is partaken of."[2]

But neither is it a mere "naked figure," for Christ offers Himself in the Sacrament. He is present there in a special manner by a representation of Himself both as He suffered for our sins and as the food of our souls. He exhibits Himself to be incorporated with us and that we may be nourished and enabled for the duties of life. Eating and drinking are indeed "things of sense, and things of sense are chosen to express faith wrought up to an experience." If the things of sense are all, then "we should come to the Lord's table like men in a dream, eating and drinking, and be quite empty when we have done; for this bread and wine will not satisfy our souls." In the last analysis he will not attempt to define the manner in which special grace is received in the Sacrament. He leaves off in the presence of mystery, "which I leave to your experience, for it is beyond expression." "It is a common, received notion among Christians, and it is true, that there is a peculiar communion with Christ in this ordinance, which we have in no other ordinance; that there is a peculiar acting of faith in this ordinance, which is in no other ordinance. This is the faith of the whole Church of Christ, and has been so in all ages."[3]

Our examination of seventeenth century Nonconformity at the Lord's Table shews us how true it is that neither Presbyterian nor Independent wandered far from the dominant principle that a return to the simplicity of the Gospel would free them from superstitious accretions. Early in the reign of James I the separatist exiles at Amsterdam sent a supplication to their King in which they expounded their principles. They desired that both Sacraments should be separated from "Popish" and "other abuse."[1] They held, too, that the Sacraments should be administered to the faithful, since they were the seals of a Divine Covenant. On this subject there was to be later a sharp difference of opinion between the great majority of Presbyterian divines at the Westminster Assembly and the five Independents. Naturally it was the Presbyterian formula permitting excommunication that was approved by Parliament, though Parliament kept to itself the position of the ultimate Court of appeal for those who felt themselves to have been unjustly excluded from communion. It remained for the Church of the Restoration to degrade the Communion into an instrument for excluding Roman Catholics and Dissenters from civil office.

---

[1] Owen, *Works*, ix. 527, 528.
[2] *Ibid*. p. 536.
[3] *Ibid*. pp. 572ff, 591, 617, 620 f.

If no mention has been made of the Baptist customs and doctrine at this time, it is because they had but little political influence under the Commonwealth, and after the Restoration they seem to have had similar usages to those of the Independents at the commemoration of the Lord's Supper. It was in their observance of the Sacrament of Baptism that their distinctive characteristic appeared. One expects to find among the Baptists rather more radical tendencies at this period than appear in the writings of men like Howe or Owen, Baxter or Goodwin. It was John Smyth (the Se-Baptist as he was called) who said that "if the charge of bread and wine be very great, as it falleth out in some counties and some years and the treasury is very low and the poor cannot be adequately relieved, it would be well to save the cost of the bread and wine, and use the money in relieving 'the necessities of the saints.'"[2] This is no text for a sermon on the Baptists' disregard for the divine ordinance. The real parallel is to be found in the act of

---

[1] *Cf.* Dale, *History of English Congregationalism*, p. 180.

[2] *Differences of the Church of the Separation*, p. 31.

Francis of Assisi who relieved the wants of a widow who came begging to the Portiuncula by selling the only copy of the Breviary since they had no other resources with which to help her. It is indeed a pathetic commentary on the poverty of these sectaries. They did but put the claims of human necessity above regularity in observing the Lord's Supper. Yet in some respects the Baptists in their revolt from ritual became the most precise ritualists. They not only insisted on immersion in Baptism, but tried to copy the exact form of the Last Supper. As the Quaker, Barclay, puts it in his *Apology*:

> "It is strange that those that are so clamorous for this Ceremony and stick so much to it, take liberty to dispense with the manner or method that Christ did it in; since none that ever I could hear of, except some Baptists, who now do it, use it in the same way that he did it: Christ did it at Supper, while they were eating; but the Generality of Protestants do it in the Morning only by itself: what rule walk they by in this change?[1]"

The era of sects and schisms "prognosticated" in the *Areopagitica* saw many strange doctrines come to light. Seekers and Ranters and Levellers have disappeared, at any rate in their seventeenth century guise, but of those schisms which reacted most vigorously against prelacy and ecclesiasticism, the Baptists and the Society of Friends remain. In those days they had many points of contact. It was among the Baptists of Nottinghamshire that George Fox seems to have found his prophetic vocation. Baptists as well as Quakers permitted their women to preach. Both alike encouraged the practice of wandering evangelists or "publishers of truth." Such organisation as they had was similar, but if a John Smyth might for reason of poverty dispense with the Lord's Supper, the later Baptists were careful in observing it, while the Quakers abolished it altogether. Richard Farnsworth was (next to Fox) the chief of the Quaker publishers of truth in the North of England, and, like Fox, he found his vocation among the Puritan sects, but with Independents rather than Baptists. He contrived to take communion among them, but found no benefit from it, for his soul longed for the living Bread.[1] This is a typical experience, and we find many of the early Friends writing in the same way. They found their spiritual food and communion in Christ Himself, and had no need of any material elements to stand between them and the spiritual reality. "The bread which the saints break," said Fox, "is the body of Christ, and the cup they drink is the blood of Christ."[2] The mere elements would melt away in fervent heat at the day of Christ, and it was necessary to build up their lives on abiding and eternal foundations. So their controversialists swept away these "outward shadows" as they termed them, and the naked soul was required to mount on the strong wings of faith to the King's presence chamber without adventitious aids or any machinery for spiritual elevation.

---

[1] Barclay, *Apology*, prop. 13.

For the Quaker the "inner light" was the primary authority, and the Scriptures came in as a secondary support for his principles. He was therefore not so much tied to the letter of the New Testament as his Puritan contemporaries, though he quoted Scripture with equal frequency in his discussions. John Owen, the Independent, was met by a Quaker opponent of equal calibre in the person of Samuel Fisher, but it was Robert Barclay who became their chief apologist. His *Apology* is dedicated to Charles II, and dated November 1675. In his discussion "concerning the Communion or Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ" he makes much of the controversies that had taken place in the Church over a sacred feast that should have been a bond of union. He allows Papists and Lutherans and Calvinists to refute one another, yet is inclined to give Calvin the credit of finding a true sense of Christ's presence in "this Ceremony." At the same time he says very shrewdly that Calvin complains that the Schoolmen "neither understand nor explain to others how Christ is in the Eucharist," and then finds that it is a secret too high for his own understanding. "Who would have thought that such a man would have been brought to this straight?" Barclay is prepared to admit that the Supper may be a true memorial of the death of Christ to those that practise it, but regrets that Calvin did not wait for "the Light that makes all things manifest," and so attached "the Spiritual Presence as chiefly and principally though not only (as he well knew by experience)" to that ordinance. The direct command of Christ which instituted the Supper referred merely to the ordinary meal or even to the common meal or love-feast in the Early Church. As often as His followers broke bread they should remember His death, but it would have been as natural to elevate the feet-washing into a sacrament as the common meal. The disciples certainly received an injunction to wash one another's feet. The spirit of humility in service would not have been developed by the ceremonial repetition of such an action, and the soul cannot be nourished by "outward flesh" nor by bread, leavened or unleavened.

---

[1] Farnsworth, *The Heart opened by Christ* (1654), p. 8.

[2] Fox quoted by Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism* (1912), p. 138, *cf.* p. 97.

Barclay finds himself very much at home in the latter part of the sixth chapter of S. John's Gospel in his spiritual interpretation of Christ as the Bread of Life. We are taught to pray every day for *τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον* i.e. "the super-substantial Bread as the Greek hath it" (he should have said as the Vulgate hath it) "and which the soul partakes of, without any relation or necessary respect to this Ceremony." Because the communion of spirit with spirit is a spiritual exercise Barclay cannot see that in eating bread or drinking wine grace is to be gained that cannot be obtained in meditation or prayer or public worship. He is severely logical, and if we accept his premises we shall be constrained to follow on to his conclusions. He is as confident as Joachim of Floris that the new day of the Spirit has already begun. Therefore he concludes the statement of his thirteenth proposition with a triumphant confidence:

> "For we certainly know, that the day is dawned, in which God hath arisen, and hath diminished all these Ceremonies and Rites, and is only to be Worshipped in Spirit; and that he appears to them who wait upon him: And that to seek God in these things is, with Mary at the Sepulchre, to seek the Living among the Dead. For we know that he is Arisen, and Revealed in Spirit, leading his Children out of these Rudiments, that they may

walk with him in his Light: To whom be Glory for ever. Amen."[1]

There were many seventeenth century Nonconformists who would have agreed with Barclay that the Sacraments were but rudiments, but they were not prepared to overlook what they considered to be their Divine origin. It was by the express command of Christ that the Lord's Supper was repeated, and it was Christ Himself who sent the Apostles out into all the world not only to preach but to baptise. They could by no means accept the argument that these ordinances were meant as temporary concessions because of the Jewish dependence upon signs. They believed that it was the Lord's will that they should continue to baptise in His name, and break the bread and drink the wine in Holy Communion until His second coming. Presbyterian and Independent might differ about the frequency of communion. They might differ as to the method of "fencing the tables." They might fight for three long weeks about celebrating the Supper round a table, coming up in companies to the table, or sitting in the pews to receive the elements.[2] The fiercest words might pass over such details as these, yet both were but seeking to find the nearest approximation to the practice of the early Church, and both alike could cordially accept the words of the *Shorter Catechism* in declaring a sacrament to be "an holy ordinance, instituted by Christ, wherein by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers."[3] Baptists indeed would accept the same definition, but inquire awkwardly about the faith of infants in Baptism, and would be unconvinced by any arguments about federal holiness, or the grace that operated in the families of the faithful. All alike would reject Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation. All alike would differ from the Established Church in laying great stress on the word *believer*, and be dissatisfied with a Communion which was open to all the parish. Individual teachers might differ as to the manner in which the benefits of the new covenant were "applied" in the Lord's Supper. They

[1] Barclay, *Apology*. Prop. xiii.

[2] *Cf*. Baillie, *Letters* ii. 195 ff: and Shaw, *History of English Church* (1640–1660), i. 344–347.

[3] *Confession*, xxviii, S. 1.

would fall back in the end on personal experience and with Calvin enlarge on the mystery of the grace which Christ was pleased to bestow in His appointed ordinance.

The end of the seventeenth century saw the dawn of toleration for Nonconformists. During the reign of Anne there was a temporary return to methods of oppression, but under the Hanoverians their disabilities were gradually removed. These years from 1689 to the middle of the eighteenth century were not days of religious zeal either in the Established Church or among the Dissenters. The greater Puritans had all died before the eighteenth century began; English Presbyterianism was declining to Unitarianism, and the other Dissenters seemed a waning force. They did not produce leaders cast in the heroic mould. They fell into a traditional routine of worship, and their decent celebrations of the Lord's Supper were regularly observed without any attempt at new interpretation or any theological setting forth of their position. Simplicity, reverence and quiet meditation were the marks of a service that aimed at recovering the atmosphere of the Last Supper.[1]

It may, indeed, be said that the Puritan aim in his observance of the Lord's Supper was governed by his belief in the supreme authority of the Scriptures. The command of Christ must be implicitly obeyed. Therefore he was scrupulously careful to listen to the injunction, "Do this in remembrance of me." Mysticism in the case of the Quaker might lead him through the clouds and shadows to the spiritual reality which was beyond all sacraments and symbols; but the Quaker was isolated from the other Dissenters. They not only insisted on a regular observance of the Communion, but endeavoured to follow the practices of the Early Church as accurately as possible. The Pilgrim Fathers carried the customs of the Independents to New England. Cotton in his *Way of the Churches of Christ in New England* (1645) speaks of the care with which the Lord's table was guarded, so that church members only should be received there.[2] Their knowledge of social conditions and habits in the first century and their historical sense might be imperfect, but they had the desire to recover the fellowship of the Early Church and to recapture the spirit of the Upper Room. It was no bare or formal memorial rite that they celebrated, but a festival of communion with their Lord. Christ had intended the feast for the nourishment of the soul, they said, and therefore it should be frequently used.[1] In early days of exile at Amsterdam a weekly observance was practised, but in America as in England the monthly observance became the rule.

---

[1] *Cf.* Stoughton, *Religion in England* (1901), v, 449 f.

[2] Quoted by Hanbury *Memorials*, ii. 568 f.

Among the Presbyterians the same principles prevailed, but a greater formality and solemnity seem to have characterised their great Communion days. The Sacrament was observed quarterly or even less frequently, but everything was planned to emphasise the importance of the occasion and to inspire a reverential awe. In degenerate days Burns might write his cruel caricature of *The Holy Fair*, yet the words he spoke in scorn were true in their best sense:

> How monie hearts this day converts
>   O' sinners and o' lasses!
> Their hearts o' stane, gin night, are gane
>   As saft as ony flesh is.

One can readily see both the advantages and the dangers of these notable dramatic days when the whole countryside gathered in long sessions of worship at the Lord's Table; yet the gains must have far outweighed the losses. The *Letters of Samuel Rutherford* have something of the oriental luxuriance of the Song of Songs mixed with their intensely devotional temper. Perhaps he alone is able to recover for us the spirit in which the great day of the feast was approached. "Mistress," he says to Marion M'Naught in the prospect of a Communion season,

> "my love in Christ as remembered. Our Communion is on Sabbath come eight days. I will entreat you to recommend it to God, and to pray for me in that week. I have more sins upon me now than the last time. . . . I invite you to the banquet. He saith, ye shall be dearly welcome to Him. And I desire to believe (howbeit not without great fear) He shall be as hearty in His own house as He has been before. For me, it is but small reckoning; but I would fain have our Father and Lord to

---

[1] *Ibid.* iii. 312.

break the great fair loaf, Christ, and to distribute His slain Son amongst the bairns of His house, and that if any were a step-bairn, in respect of comfort and sense, it were rather myself than His poor bairns. Therefore bid our well-beloved come to His garden and feed among the lilies."[1]

Among English Presbyterians there seems to have been nothing that corresponded to these great days of the renewal of the covenant between the individual soul and the merciful God of the Covenant that meant so much to Scotland. Not only were they the church of a minority but of a dwindling minority. After the great days of the Westminster Assembly of Divines the prospect of Presbyterianism becoming the Established Church of England became more and more remote. By the end of the seventeenth century the Independents were the more numerous body, and some of the Presbyterian congregation were moving towards Unitarianism. The English Unitarians continued to observe the Lord's Supper with the same tradition of reverence but with a changed interpretation; though one must feel that in later days the spiritual outlook of a Martineau or a Drummond with their intense reverence for the person of Jesus of Nazareth must, in their observance of the Lord's Supper, have lifted them out of the rigid logic of their theological position. It was, however, not merely English Presbyterianism that was affected by the change of atmosphere which the eighteenth century brought with it; all the churches were conscious of it. The cool rationalism that dreaded any recurrence of seventeenth century fanaticism and "enthusiasm," the demand for a religion of common sense was satisfied by the Moderatism of Scotland and by the lethargic temper both of the Church of England and of the English Nonconformists. It is a singular fact that the individual who was destined to break up this torpor was not only English of the English, in his practical and energetic genius, but almost typically eighteenth century in the orderly and reasonable temper of his mind.

John Wesley was, however, something more than a very able eighteenth century English religious leader. He blended in his own personality in a very remarkable manner the two conflicting strains of English religion in their most intense form. Both his maternal and paternal grandfathers were Puritan Nonconformists of the strongest type, ejected from their livings in 1662. His mother and his father, independently of each other, reacted towards the Caroline school which carried on the traditions of Andrewes and Laud under the changed conditions of William III and Queen Anne. If Susanna Wesley were the more tenacious "High Churchman" of the two, and stood nearer to the Nonjurors in her tenets than her husband, she was not sufficiently liberated from her Puritan upbringing to restrain herself from holding a conventicle in her kitchen at Epworth when Samuel Wesley was away from home. John Wesley accepted from his mother her Arminian theology and, apparently, something of the attitude of the Nonjuror. Nothing is more interesting in his character than the interplay of the Caroline High Anglican and the Puritan elements within him. This blend of reverence for tradition and of typically Protestant individualism in a man endowed with fine qualities of mind and heart made him the most effective religious leader that our race has produced. At first the Caroline elements were predominant in shaping his career, but more and more the Puritan ancestry asserted itself, and there is little exaggeration in the claim of Father Piette that Wesley was the saviour of Protestantism and himself a typical Protestant.[1] Yet we shall be able to trace little change throughout his long life in his views on the Sacraments.

---

[1] Rutherford's *Letters*, No. xviii.

In an age when attendance at Holy Communion was rare and irregular in the Church of England the Wesleys and the Holy Club revived the practice of frequent communion at Oxford. They communicated every Sunday and every Holy Day and scrupulously observed all the rules and rubrics of the Church. Thus they won for themselves the nickname of Sacramentarians and Methodists, but it was the latter title that prevailed. There was, however, no superstitious veneration for an ancient rite in this regularity. In his earliest diary (1726) we find a note of a conversation with his friends at Stanton Rectory on the nature of a sacrament.

---

[1] M. Piette, *La réaction de John Wesley dans l'Evolution de Protestantisme :* a most enlightening and sympathetic study by a Belgian Franciscan.

"Much harm is done by exaggerating the venerableness of it. Proposing it as an object of fear rather than love deters multitudes from receiving it."[1] The Oxford Methodists did attach great importance to every detail of the service, and mixed water with the wine, following a custom of the Early Church. In Georgia, Wesley repelled from the Sacrament his saintly friend Bolzius, the German pastor, because he had not been baptised by a minister who had been episcopally ordained; an action which he regretted at a later date.[2] During his three months' voyage to Georgia (1735–6) Wesley mentions twenty books that he read aboard ship. Apart from a German Grammar all the books belong to the ecclesiastical and liturgical category. Five were written by Nonjurors, three by Roman Catholics, and most of the rest emanated from Caroline Churchmen. Jeremy Collier's *Reasons for Restoring some Prayers* pleads for the first prayer book of Edward VI and the *Apostolical Constitutions*. Thomas Deacon in his *Complete Collection of Devotions*, which had appeared in 1734, followed his fellow Nonjuror in this matter, and quotes him in his support at the end of his book along with George Hickes, Bishop Andrewes and Samuel Wesley. He regarded the Eucharist as a "material sacrifice" but rejected the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He followed Collier again in declaring that the Sacrament must be reserved for the sick. "Kept under a safe lock and the remains of the elements carefully eaten and drunk." Both these Nonjurors would mix water with the wine in Communion, and both put Gen. iv. 3–4 as the first of the offertory sentences. Wesley had met Deacon at Manchester, but we have no proof that he accepted all his views. Another book read on the voyage was *The Unbloody Sacrifice* by John Johnson, who also rejected Transubstantiation, but held that "the Bread and the Wine are consecrated unto the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ by the secret operation of the Holy Ghost." Wesley might well have accepted this statement while agreeing with the *Missale Romanum* by Daniel Brevint, Dean of Lincoln, which was a vigorous attack on the Romish doctrine of the Mass.[3]

---

[1] *Journal* (Standard Edition 1909, etc.), i. 61.

[2] *Journal*, iii. 434.

[3] *Cf. Proceedings* (Wesley Historical Society, June, 1921), for an article on Wesley's reading during the voyage to Georgia.

If the books that Wesley read during the voyage do not necessarily reveal his own thought, they do at least shew where his sympathies lay, and it is significant that he afterwards reprinted no less than eight of them either in part or in full. In the study of our theme, his most interesting publication is that of 166 Hymns on the Lord's Supper which appeared in 1745, with a preface extracted from Dean Brevint's *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice.* They were published in the name of John and Charles Wesley, "Presbyters of the Church of England," and passed through eleven editions in the next eighty years. Brevint's treatise is divided into sections concerning the Sacrament:

> "As it is a Memorial of the Sufferings and Death of Christ."
> "As it is a Sign of present Graces."
> "As it is a Means of Grace."
> "As it is a Pledge of Future Glory."
> "As it is a Sacrifice (*a*) a commemorative sacrifice, (*b*) a sacrifice of ourselves."

It is a well-written devotional manual, and in places one or other of the Wesleys adopted whole paragraphs of it and turned them into verse. The first 157 hymns are arranged to illustrate the five sections of Brevint's treatise; a sixth section consists of nine hymns to be used after the Sacrament.[1] Christ's body and blood, says Brevint,

> "have everywhere, but especially at this Sacrament a true and real presence. When He offered Himself upon earth, vapour of His atonement went up and darkened the very sun: and by rending the great veil it clearly showed He had made a way into heaven. And since He is gone up He sends down to earth the graces that spring continually both from His everlasting sacrifice, and from the continual intercession that attends it. So then we need not say, 'Who will go up into heaven?' since, without either ascending or descending, this sacred body of Jesus fills with atonement and blessing the remotest parts of His temple."[2]

---

[1] *Poetical Works* of J. and C. Wesley, iii. (1869), 181–342.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. 197.

The whole of this and the preceding paragraphs is versified with remarkable facility in the hymn 116:

Victim, Divine, Thy grace we claim,

of which the fifth and last verse is:

We need not now go up to heaven
To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost even now Thy banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And show Thy real presence here!

Too much should not be made of Brevint's vague and mystical language in endeavouring to assess Wesley's doctrine: it seems from a careful study of the hymns that for once he finds himself at home with Calvin and is prepared to take refuge in a reticent agnosticism, as in Hymn 77:

Who shall say how bread and wine
God into man conveys!
How the bread His flesh imparts,
How the wine transmits His blood,
Fills His faithful people's hearts
With all the life of God!

or again in Hymn 92:

It doth not appear
His manner of working; but Jesus is here!

The hymns are full of the sense of the spiritual presence of the Lord in the Sacrament because it is a specially appointed channel of grace. While the peculiar value of the Sacrament is emphasised, there is no denial of the validity of other means of grace. In hymn 42 we find this clearly phrased:

Fasting he doth, and hearing bless,
And prayer can much avail.
Good vessels all to draw the grace
Out of salvation's well.
But none, like this mysterious rite
Which dying mercy gave,
Can draw forth all His promised might
And all His will to save.

It is clear that the Wesleys believed in the Lord's Supper as the chief means of grace, not merely available for the nourishment of saints but for the conversion of sinners. Little wonder that they encouraged frequent communion.

Yet the appeal to the Wesleys as supporters of present-day "high" doctrine in the Church of England will fail at many points. The most that can be said of their teaching has been well put by Dr. J. E. Rattenbury. "They believed in a mystical relationship between the consecrated bread and Christ's body.[1] Perhaps they would have accepted the Archbishop of York's term 'transvaluation.'"[2] But John Wesley frequently denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the doctrine of the Mass. He criticised the crossings and sprinklings, the reverences and genuflexions of the Roman service,[3] and definitely denied the corporal presence of Christ in the elements. "We freely own that Christ is to be adored in the Lord's Supper; but that the elements are to be adored we deny."[4]

If the mystical language of the hymns may sometimes suggest a closer approximation to Roman Catholic teaching than the Wesleys ever admitted, we should remember that they regarded the Sacrament as a powerful means of preaching Christ crucified just as Owen did in his *Sacramental Discourses*. The Eucharist is a sacrifice, they keep repeating, and not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving but a re-presentation in picture of the sacrifice of Calvary. That abides the "one sacrifice for sins for ever" and can never be repeated; it can only be revivified to the believing heart:

The Lamb as crucified afresh
  Is here held out to men,
The tokens of His blood and flesh
  Are on this table seen.[5]

Dr. Rattenbury's conclusions exactly express their attitude, and his observations on the last sections of this remarkable hymn-book cannot be improved:

> "To keep in memory the sacrificial aspects of our Lord's death by symbol as well as teaching is quite a different thing from repeating a sacrifice. These hymns expound the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews; they do not, like the Roman Mass, contradict it. One more group should be mentioned—the hymns that glory in

---

[1] Wesley's *Works*, x. 118.
[2] Rattenbury, *Wesley's Legacy to the World* (1928), p. 179.
[3] *Works*, x. 122 f.
[4] *Works*, x. 121.
[5] *Poetical Works* of J. and C. Wesley, iii. 310.

the Communion of the Saints. They make us realize that the Church triumphant in Holy Communion is at one with the church militant. Two noble instances of this must be noticed. Charles Wesley's memorial hymn to his mother is one:

What are these arrayed in white?

and the other contains the glorious lines:

The Church triumphant in Thy love.
Their mighty joys we know;
They sing the Lamb in hymns above
And we in hymns below.
Thee in Thy glorious realm we praise
And bow before Thy throne,
We in the kingdom of Thy grace,
The kingdoms are but one.[1]

Not only is the Communion of Saints sung, but the communion also of saints and angels, of all spirits visible and invisible, who join with erring mortals in the devotions of the holy table:

Angels in fixt amazement
Around our altars hover
With eager gaze
Absorb the grace
Of our Eternal Lover.[2]

And the greatest of Wesley's hymns of consecration:

Father, Son and Holy Ghost;
God of all redeeming grace;
O Thou Who camest from above—

are the hymns whereby Methodists made their vow of consecration at the table of the Lord."[3]

It should be added that the last hymn of the collection is a prayer for the restoration of what Charles Wesley calls the "daily sacrifice." He contrasts the deadness of the Church of that time with the love and holiness of the Early Church when

In holy fellowship they lived
Nor would from the commandment move,
But every joyful day received
The tokens of expiring Love.

It may not have been the practice of the Wesleys to observe a daily Communion, but John Wesley seems to have communicated once every four or five days throughout his long career.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.* iii. 286.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. 338.
[3] Rattenbury, *Wesley's Legacy to the World*, p. 185 f.]

He was also successful in persuading the early Methodists to approach the Lord's Table as frequently as possible. The Sacrament was administered weekly to the London Societies, and when the American colonies achieved their independence and became "totally disentangled both from the State and from the English Hierarchy," Wesley counted the Methodists there free to "simply follow the Scriptures and the primitive Church."[2] Therefore he took steps to provide them with an ordained ministry that should "administer the supper of the Lord on every Lord's Day." It is astonishing to read in the *Journal* of the crowds who gathered at Communion. Some extracts may be of interest:

> "May 29, 1743 (being Trinity Sunday) I preached at West Street on the Gospel for the day, part of the third chapter of St. John; and afterwards administered the Lord's Supper to some hundreds of communicants. I was a little afraid at first that my strength would not suffice for the business of the day, when a service of five hours (for it lasted from ten to three) was added to my usual employment. But God looked to that: so I must think; and they that will call it enthusiasm may.
>
> The following week I spent in visiting the society. On Sunday, June 5, the service of the chapel lasted till near four in the afternoon; so that I found it needful, for the time to come, to divide the communicants into three parts, that we might not have above six hundred at once."

The form of service used by Wesley was, of course, that of the Church of England except for the omission of certain rubrics and parts of the Exhortation, and it is used by the Methodists to this day. The Wesleyan Methodists have followed the Anglican service more closely than some of the other Methodist bodies, which have at times approximated to the form of Communion service used by Nonconformists. Indeed the Evangelical Revival had the effect of producing a revival of the Lord's Supper in the parish churches, for it was a great innovation when the Methodists came crowding there to communion. When Wesley died there were not enough ordained ministers to administer the Sacraments to the Methodist people. The vast majority of the Methodists had no living association with the parish church, and naturally preferred that the men who preached the Word of Life to them should also administer to them the bread and wine of Holy Communion. There were, however, some of the most influential preachers and laymen who still desired that the Sacraments should be received in the parish church. Four years of discussion ended in a curious compromise in 1795 called the Plan of Pacification. This left the decision largely to the local officials, provided that the Conference gave its consent. This meant that the wish of the majority prevailed and the Methodist preachers became ministers of the Word *and* the Sacraments. For some time it was the rule that the Sacrament should not be administered in the Methodist chapels on the Sundays when it was administered in the parish church. Moreover, it was to be observed in the evening to avoid "Church hours." "And so," says Mr. Barratt "there came into being a thing entirely new to Methodism—the Sunday evening Communion service—and Wesley's wonderful morning sacramental service was forgotten. All this was done out of deference to the Church of England. But the Methodists have paid a sad price for the pathetic loyalty of their fathers to their old unkindly mother. Adam Clarke writing in 1816, said "The Methodists in England have incomparably more grace and more stability since the introduction of the Sacraments than before. But these four years of prohibition (1791–1795), followed by the restrictions of 1795, created a tradition that went far to annul the teaching and example of John Wesley, and sowed seeds of which we reap the harvest even to this day."[1]

---

[1] Article by T. H. Barratt in *London Quarterly Review*, April, 1923.

[2] *Cf. Journals*, vii. 17.

Perhaps we have lingered too long over the views of the Wesleys, but the importance of the Wesleyan movement in English religious life has often been under-estimated. Recent historians have not made this mistake in writing about the eighteenth century, but it is only yesterday that the significance of Methodism in English history in the first

[1] T. H. Barratt, *London Quarterly Review*, April, 1923.

half of the nineteenth century has received anything like adequate recognition. It has fallen to the lot of a Frenchman (M. Elie Halévy) to shew how profoundly the whole life of the nation was influenced after Wesley's death by the forces which he liberated. The importance of Methodism in the years 1800 to 1850 was due not merely to the fact that it was still the most vital religious force in England, nor to its indirect influence both on the Church of England and the Nonconformists, but because of the strategic position it held between the two main divisions into which organized religion in England was separated. The Oxford Movement brought with it a new alignment of forces and the growth of Roman Catholicism after the Emancipation of 1829 also influenced the situation, but in the first half of the nineteenth century the Evangelicals were the dominant influence, and all of them owed something to Wesley. For more than a generation after John Wesley's death, the Wesleyan Methodists refused to be called Dissenters or Nonconformists, and in their conservative temper looked more to the Established Church than to Dissent for signs of kinship. Their separation, however, had become so definite that force of circumstances led them step by step nearer to the Free Churches until to-day they group with them altogether. It is in the use of the form for Morning Prayer in some of their churches and in their universal use of the Church of England form for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, Baptism, Marriage and Burial as revised by John Wesley that their original filiation appears.

The Methodists have not produced many great theologians. They are an intensely practical people. Having secured the administration of the Sacraments by their own preachers, they reserved that office to those who had been ordained after a four-year period of probation. They rarely paused to inquire either how the two phrases that seemed to represent the old and the new dispensation had come together in the words they used in distributing the elements or what the significance of them was. The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI were nothing to them, but they continued to say to every communicant, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." It was enough for them that they met their Lord in the Sacrament; there was no need to find an exact interpretation of the old phraseology. Of their theologians, Richard Watson was inclined to turn to the formulae and interpretations of the Church of Scotland, while W. B. Pope at a later date inclined to higher doctrine and found a mystical elevation of spirit in Holy Communion such as belonged to no other means of grace; strangely enough the same tendencies and differences are represented to-day by the two Wesleyan theologians who have written of this subject, Charles Ryder Smith and Frederic Platt, who are akin to Watson and Pope respectively.[1] Watson was vigorous in his criticism of the "monstrous theory of the Church of Rome," Transubstantiation and the adoration of the host. He considered that the doctrine of the Church of England agreed mainly with that of Calvin, "except that we may perhaps perceive in her services a few expressions favourable to the views of Luther and Melanchthon." Since the twenty-eighth Article substantially agreed with the New Testament, he considered that it was satisfactory from the Methodist standpoint. In his further exposition Watson adopts the Presbyterian phraseology of the Sacrament as a sign and seal of the covenant of redemption, and stresses the service as one that for ever preaches the doctrine of the Cross and has the note of thanksgiving predominant. Not only unbelievers but "all who reject the doctrine of the atonement made by the vicarious death of Christ for the remission of sins" should be excluded from the Lord's Table, but "all are welcome there who truly love Christ." As to frequent communion, he was of the opinion that "the general custom in this country of a monthly administration" preserved the spirit of the ancient rite.[2] Richard Watson may be regarded as a typical Evangelical of the early Victorian period.

Dr. W. B. Pope was the leading exponent of the theology of the same school a generation later, and he gives a richer content to the Lord's Supper. "This ordinance is the

---

[1] *Cf.* C. Ryder Smith *The Sacramental Society* (1927) and Frederic Platt *Immanence and Christian Thought* (1915).

[2] Watson, *Theological Institutes*, iv. 465 ff.

Sacrament, as it signifies and seals the mystical nourishment of Christ: the Eucharist, as commemorating the sacrifice of redemption; and the Communion as the badge of united Christian profession."[1] His summary of the historical development of the doctrine is short but sensitively accurate in its appreciation of the shades of distinction between different schools of thought. Therefore his conclusion that with the views of Calvin, "perhaps the Presbyterian Confession, and certainly the Anglican, substantially agree," should be allowed due weight. "But," he adds, "the notion that the Sacrament is only a commemorative and representative rite is held by many of the religious communities of England."[2] Such a bare doctrine he cannot accept, but demands that each of the terms "sign" and "seal" should have its full meaning preserved. "That which the sign represents and the seal pledges is a benefit from Christ which must not be separated from Christ Himself."[3] In the great emphasis that he placed on Holy Communion as the chief means of grace, Pope did not altogether represent Methodism. With the Methodists, as with the Presbyterians and the other Free Churches, the ministry of the word came before that of the Sacraments, and there was always the tendency in all these churches that the Lord's Supper should tend to become merely "a commemorative and representative rite." The exposition of A. A. Hodge, the typical Presbyterian theologian of this period (1860), is in general agreement with that of Pope, but he allows that in exceptional circumstances the Sacraments may be administered by laymen. Possibly his American liberty of action influenced him, for it is quite contrary to Presbyterian discipline; indeed, the *First Book of Discipline* declares that such action might be punishable with death. As recently as 1907, when the Presbyterian Church of England discussed the possibility of giving permission to ordained elders to administer the Sacraments in Mission Halls in the absence of the minister, the proposal was negatived.[4]

If W. B. Pope implied that his fellow Methodists were inclined to accept an impoverished view of the Lord's Supper, R. W. Dale said much the same concerning his fellow

[1] Pope, *Christian Theology* (1875–6), iii. 325.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. 334. [3] *Ibid.* iii. 334.
[4] *Cf.* J. Stalker (*Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, x. 915).

Congregationalists at the same period. Dale traces the Congregational doctrine of the Sacraments down from the Westminster Assembly of Divines. This was accepted in substance by an assembly of Independent ministers and laymen held at the Savoy after Cromwell's death in 1688. It fully acknowledged the objective value of the Sacraments as representing Christ and His benefits. "Worthy receivers outwardly partaking of the visible Elements in the Sacrament, do then also inwardly by Faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death." By 1833, when the Congregationalists wished to make some statement of the principles accepted by the new Congregational Union, all they found to say about the Lord's Supper was that they believed in its perpetual obligation and that it was "to be celebrated by Christian Churches as a token of faith in the Saviour and of brotherly love."[1] Dale considered that a lowered sense of the value of the Lord's Supper had arisen by which a subjective theory of the Sacraments had replaced all conception of their objective value. Probably the overwhelming majority of the Congregationalist ministers of the generation that preceded him were satisfied with the 1833 statement. He himself felt limitations, and lived to see a day dawn in his own Church in which there were signs of a return to the stronger meat of the seventeenth century. He professed to understand the Roman doctrine of the Lord's Supper and that of the Reformed Church but the Anglo-Catholic theory, he ,said "has defied every attempt we have made to apprehend it."[2] The same charge was soon made against Dale's own teaching by his fellow Nonconformists. He was concerned with the charge that the Nonconformist Communion was merely the commemoration of an absent Lord. He therefore strongly asserted that we come to the Ordinance not for self-examination but to hold intercourse with Christ who instituted it, and that the symbolism of the Ordinance represents a permanent and perpetual participation of believers in the Divine Life.[3] He was actually attacked by some ministers of his own church for what they considered to be "sacerdotal teaching" on the subject. It was the spiritual presence of Christ in the Church rather than in the consecrated elements for which he contended, and he showed his freedom from "sacerdotalism" by his repudiation of the language of the seventeenth century Independents, when they denied that the Lord's Supper "may be dispensed by any but a minister of the Word lawfully called." Perhaps his son's interpretation of his position is the best summary that can be given of what Dale felt in Holy Communion:

---

[1] Dale, *History of English Congregationalism*, p. 706 f.

[2] A. W. W. Dale, *Life of R. W. Dale* (1898), p. 212.

[3] *Cf. Evangelical Magazine*, Jan. Dec. 1867 and *Ecclesia*, ed. Dr. H. R. Reynolds. Dale on *Doctrine of the Real Presence and the Lord's Supper*.

> "The Lord's Supper . . . was a kind of perennial endowment of the Church with His presence—a spiritual presence, indeed, but therefore all the more real. Men were to come to it, not that they might give but that they might receive. Through its symbols the Saviour gave Himself. He who received entered into a richer fellowship with Him, realised His presence in the symbols and in the society by which they were at once preserved and administered."[1]

The mid-Victorian and late-Victorian period was an age that bristled with personalities. This was quite as true in the religious communities as in any other sphere of activity in England at that time. It was an age of great preachers, and their preaching was more theological than it is to-day. We shall, therefore, find the real mind of the Free Churches at that time if we turn to preachers like Dale and Spurgeon, Monro Gibson or Hugh Price Hughes. The views of the great Wesleyan preacher were almost identical with those of Dale. He, too, was dissatisfied with the tendency then prevalent in Nonconformist circles to a purely commemorative view of the Lord's Supper. Many held that the Risen Lord was not more present to believers partaking of the bread and wine than to believers in any other sacred rite of the Church. This seemed to Hughes quite an inadequate view, and he found Hooker to be the most satisfactory exponent of a difficult theme:

> "An increased feeling for the place and function of Holy Communion in the Christian life," says his daughter, "led him to prefer more frequent participation than is usual in most Nonconformist Churches, but this could

---

[1] *Life of R. W. Dale*, p. 720.

> not blind him to the fact that members of the Church of Scotland, for instance, in their high regard for the solemnity of the rite and the necessary preparation for it, communicate only four times in the year. These and kindred interpretations on the part of fellow-Christians would have prevented him from ever formulating hard-and-fast rules. His business, he felt, in all departments of Christian thinking was not to consult his own particular tastes or school of training, but humanity and the 'facts.' The 'facts' were the interpreters of tradition, and he viewed tradition in the light they shed on it."[1]

His own views were supported by Dr. Berry, the Wolverhampton Congregationalist minister, and in the formation of the Free Church Council they took the opportunity of impressing on Nonconformist congregations in all parts of the country the great need of worthier conceptions of the Church and the Sacraments.

The same views were being expressed at the same time by Dr. P. T. Forsyth in his own characteristic manner. An influential thinker with (to some people) a repellant style, crabbed and epigrammatic, he was an Independent of the Independents who, nevertheless, felt the same need for a deepening of the current Nonconformist views of the Church's institutions. He considered that a Church that neglected the Sacraments could not survive. Almost his last published work was his *Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments*, and he began where Dale had begun in his word to the Congregationalists of fifty years before. "There is no suggestion of a higher gift than grace, of God's essence all divine, being infused into the soul. But there is far more than the memorial of an event or the mere symbol of an idea."[2] His exposition does not readily lend itself to quotation, especially in its constructive part. He is still so much of a Protestant that his negations are more powerful than his affirmations. "Far be it from me to deny that the idea of a heavenly food is foreign to the rite," he says, "but it is not the ruling idea."[3] He finds the ruling idea of the Lord's Supper to be the fact that Christ is still the chief actor, the host and giver of the common meal, forever present in the midst of the disciples. He also stresses the value of the moral conceptions that it is a common act of a fellowship, and therefore the focus and real meeting-place of the church.

---

[1] *Life of Price Hughes*, p. 632 f (Pop. Edition 1904).
[2] Forsyth, *Lectures on the Church and Sacraments*, p. 224.
[3] *Op. cit.* 250.

An interesting form of service was introduced by Dr. John Hunter at the King's Weigh House (the well-known London Congregational Church), a form which he had previously used at Trinity Presbyterian Church, Glasgow. Here Anglican and Presbyterian elements are found together, for we have the exhortation to penitent believers ("Ye that do truly and earnestly repent"), the Confession, the Prayer of Humble Access, and the Comfortable Words as part of the service. The Commandments are taken from the New Testament, additions and changes are found in the sentences and the Prayers, and there is room for silence and for extempore prayer. The words of institution are read, and before the distribution of the elements the Minister says "Let us eat of this bread in remembrance of Christ, and may the life which was in Him be in us also"; and again, "Let us drink of the cup in remembrance of Christ, and may the spirit in which He died be our spirit."[1]

At the King's Weigh House to-day, a much higher doctrine is taught, and Dr. Orchard's *Order of Divine Service* would seem to many Nonconformists nearer to Rome than to Canterbury, to say nothing of Geneva. Dr. Orchard cannot be considered representative, but it must be remembered that he was originally a Presbyterian minister and is now the pastor (if he would acknowledge such a title) of a Congregational church. His valuable book of offices has both "A simple observance of the Lord's Supper" and "The order for the celebration of the Eucharist or the Sacrament of Holy Communion." The former is of great simplicity, in which the "President" makes use of words from the New Testament alone. The latter is very elaborate; ancient liturgies have been studied; an alert and devout mind has been at work to come as near to the Roman Mass as possible, cherishing every devotional element in it, and exalting the mystery of the repeated Sacrifice to the highest degree. If Dr. Orchard were in any way representative of the Free

---

[1] John Hunter, *Devotional Services* (1901 edition).

Churches it would be worth while studying this Order of Service in detail, but as he is merely the spokesman of the Free Catholic community, the curious are referred to his service book or to the ritual of the King's Weigh House itself.[1]

In the same way the late Dr. James Cooper could hardly be regarded as a typical exponent of the views of the Church of Scotland on this subject, though his affinities were rather with Anglo-Catholicism than with Rome. He found very early in his ministry (1873) that the annual celebration of the Communion (which is still common in the Highlands) was beginning to yield to a celebration twice a year. He was able then to secure a quarterly celebration, but found the sick-bed celebrations more difficult of achievement, in view of the strict regulations of the *Westminster Directory*. He ventured to break the rule, but by introducing others to the sick chamber, made it a Communion *in facie ecclesiae*.[2] The way of innovation in so conservative a Church was, however, difficult, and in spite of Dr. Cooper's great success in Aberdeen he found many of his ecclesiastical ideals unfulfilled. Scotland was not prepared for the early morning Communion and the fasting Communion of the Anglican Church, and he was constrained to say on one occasion, "A great many of our Scottish customs are mere remains of barbarism with nothing except habit to recommend them."[3] He found a sympathetic biographer in W. S. Wotherspoon, whose contributions to the literature of this subject are of more importance than any other recent publications by ministers of the Church of Scotland. In 1900 Mr. Wotherspoon published a devotional manual for use before and after Communion, and in 1905 an edition of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, with a historical introduction of great interest to students of the Scottish Reformation. It is, however, his book on the *Religious Values of the Sacraments*, being the Croall Lectures for 1926–7, which is of most importance for our purpose. He is of the opinion that there are signs of sacramental revival in the Church of Scotland. "Among the 'Free Churches' it appears in the work of such writers as the late Professor Forsyth, Professor Platt, Professor Andrews, Dr. Orchard and of Fr. Peck, while still a Wesleyan."[1] It should be said in amendment of this statement that Fr. Peck was not a Wesleyan but a United Methodist minister before he became a High Anglican priest.

---

[1] *Divine Service*, pp. 119–140.

[2] H. J. Wotherspoon, *James Cooper—a Memoir*, p. 97.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 225.

Mr. Wotherspoon's lectures provide us with a singularly thoughtful and practical discussion of his subject, and the title of them is a true indication of their subject-matter. He is concerned with *religious* values throughout, rather than the triumph of any school of thought. "I should doubt," he says, in a convincing passage, "whether at the Holy Table itself it is possible to be a Sacramentarian." Here he uses the term in its technical sense as applied to those who emptied the Sacrament of all objective content:

> "No part of the historic Church is sacramentarian in its authorized teaching: everywhere it is held—by Geneva and Scotland, by Anglican and Lutheran formulas, as emphatically as by antiquity by the orthodox and the East generally, and by Romanism—that the Body and Blood are given and that their reception is intimately identified with the reception of the Elements and that their reception is objective and actual."[2]

This is possibly a correct interpretation of the historic formulae of the Churches, but we have seen that not all the religious communities have lived up to their earlier standards. It is stimulating to such communities that they should hear Mr. Wotherspoon's warning that the "danger to all non-sacramental religion is that of drifting into mere philanthropy."[3] We do not, however, find in these lectures any blind regard for the Sacrament as an *opus operatum*. The lecturer is anxious to find a common meeting place for all Christians, and he believes that all would agree that the spiritual part of the Sacrament can only be effectively received upon spiritual conditions. The communicant must himself be in a state of grace and his faith must be active in its reception of the gifts of Christ. "The idea that the blessings of the Sacrament are mechanically appropriated by the physical act of reception or that participation in

---

[1] *Relig. Values of the Sacraments*, Pref. vii.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 276.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 297.

Sacraments can be a guarantee of salvation, is nowhere entertained, much less thought."[1] This is surely true of all the schools of thought referred to in this chapter, but can it be so confidently affirmed of the so-called Catholic schools in England, whether Anglican or Roman?

With all his esteem for the phraseology and atmosphere of High Anglicanism, Mr. Wotherspoon seems to come down very definitely against any adoration of the reserved elements. He would certainly not carry all his own communion with him in demanding reservation of the elements for the sake of the sick and absent on the ground that the Sacrament "is not over till all who wait to be fed have received."[2] But though elements can be reserved, the Sacrament itself cannot. He cannot find any authority for regarding these elements as in themselves "the focus of adoration of a presence of Christ carried by them." In his clear repudiation of the value of the sacrificial act merely *ex opere operantis* and of the practice of the adoration of the reserved elements, Mr. Wotherspoon shows himself true to what is best in Presbyterian tradition, while desiring to give to Holy Communion a place of greater significance in the National Church of Scotland. We are not surprised therefore that he approves the presence of crowds of non-communicants at the celebration of the Lord's Supper as is frequently the practice in the North of Scotland. His esteem for some of the customs of his own church comes out in his declaration that he doubts "whether more intense realization or more active devotion can be found at a Continental or Anglican altar than is manifest in the heart-searching solemnity of any Highland Communion."[3]

It may be said that the 1927 Croall Lectures were not a true representation of the real thought of the Church of Scotland on this subject, and still less did they represent the United Free Church. The answer to such a criticism would be that it is impossible in such broad general discussions to express at all times the common mind of any fellowship. Doubtless Mr. Wotherspoon would carry most Presbyterians with him in the greater part of the discussion, and yet there is a marked change in phraseology and in atmosphere as we turn from Mr. Wotherspoon back to the popular handbook of Dr. Candlish on the Sacraments which was published in 1886. Possibly the liturgical and sacramental literature of other communions has been more deeply studied in the intervening years. If we turn next to the Chalmers Lectures for 1922, which were given by Dr. R. S. Simpson of the High Church, Edinburgh, we find the true successor of Dr. Candlish. This deeply spiritual and thought-provoking book was published posthumously under the title, *Ideas in Corporate Worship*. In his lecture on Eucharistic Worship he sets aside the attitude of the Friends and the Salvationists to the Sacraments, not only because they evade the command of Christ, but because it is the universal experience of the Church that believers have a "special communion with Jesus Christ our Redeemer at that Holy Service. The highest expressions of worship are to be found in eucharistic Liturgies and eucharistic Hymns. The deepest parts of the great devotional books are those which speak of sacramental worship as in Thomas à Kempis in the Roman Church, John Keble in the Anglican Church and our own Scottish Samuel Rutherford."[1] It is surely possible that if all the saints of all religious communions could meet at the Holy Table and could compare their experiences and meditations together, they would find little scope for disagreement, but would greet one another in a rapturous *O Altitudo*! of faith and love. Such an attitude as that of Dr. Simpson is not in any sense a departure from the traditional line of high Presbyterianism, but it stretches out the right hand of fellowship with a more inviting gesture.

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 277. [2] *Ibid.* p. 287. [3] *Ibid.* p. 276.

Dr. Simpson restates the three significant elements in the Scottish tradition concerning the Lord's Supper. The first is the habitual association of the Word of the preacher with the Sacraments. Here Scotland is true to what is best in Catholic tradition, in the oldest liturgy and in S. Augustine. The ministry of the Word is enlightening and a means of grace, but it is incomplete without the Sacraments. There are spiritual aspirations as well as fancies and imaginings that "break through language and escape." Where "truth in aptest words may fail," it may come home to the imagination and the heart in the picture or acted parable of the Sacrament. In this connection both Candlish and

---

[1] *Ideas in Corporate Worship*, p. 25 f.

Simpson quote the words of the old Scottish preacher, Robert Bruce, to the effect that "the Sacrament is appointed that we may get a better grip of Christ nor we get in the simple Word. For be the Sacrament my faith is nourished, the bounds of my soull is enlarged, and sa, quhere I had but a little grip of Christ before, as it were betwixt my finger and my thumb, now I get Him in my haill hande; and ay the mair that my faith growes, the better grip I get of Christ Jesus."[1] The second significant element is the emphasis of the presence of Christ as the Host at the Supper. There is no need of any directing or sacrificing Priest, for "the Lord Himself presides at the Communion service." It is the Master Himself who says to each communicant, "This is my body," and the profound silence of the reception is as impressive as the adoration of the elements in the Roman Mass, and springs from the same motive.[2] The third necessary element is the emphasis on the congregation. There can be no family meal without the family. The tables are no longer spread in the nave or transept of the church, but the white cloth in the pew is the symbol of that table. It is no Communion unless there are three communicants, but the family is not merely those who happen to be present at that particular celebration, but the whole family of God. However, "we need not celebrate for the blessed dead. Ours is the imperfect offering: theirs is the perfect: but we can always celebrate *with* them in Jesus Christ, for we are never far from them." This is the significance of the great Doxology, "Therefore with Angels and Archangels, etc."[3]

Dr. Simpson admits that the Puritan influence in his Church may have tended to weaken the adoration of the Saviour in Holy Communion, and therefore lessened its value both as a means of grace and a form of worship. He would restore the Communion Service to its place as the greatest of all services. At the same time he does not advocate frequent communion. He sees some of the objections to the Scottish custom, and allows that there seems a danger of loss of grace to the community because of the infrequency of celebrations, but "how much is gained by the sense of the greatness of the occasion and the solemnity of the great corporate act of worship."[1] These Chalmers Lectures would doubtless have given real pleasure to the great churchman in honour of whose name they were delivered, and they are marked not only by loyalty to what is best in Presbyterian tradition, but by a deepened sense of the value of the Lord's Supper and an enriched devotional experience which should equip the Presbyterianism of to-morrow with new power. The same tendencies are at work in the English Free Churches. Beginning with lofty views of the Lord's Supper as a divine ordinance, they passed through periods when sacramentarian doctrines seemed wide-spread. A modern Methodist like Dr. C. Ryder Smith while rejecting sacerdotalist views, calls himself a sacramentalist rather than a sacramentarian, for "the sacramentalist asserts that our Lord Himself is present in the Eucharist; that in the Lord's Supper there is a Holy Communion, a true fellowship between Jesus Christ and His disciples. He is not an absentee."[2] The specialised presence of the Lord at the Supper is due to the family communion of the Church. Just as every saint is "really" present to Christ, so is Christ to His saints.[3] The value of the symbolism of the Supper is that it *asserts* the worth of a fellowship which manifests itself in many other ways but is perfectly set forth in symbol alone. The Methodists are troubled about the infrequency of their Communion services in remote villages where they have no resident minister. In the scheme for Methodist union they have so far broken with their traditions as to make provision for the administration of the Sacraments by lay preachers, under defined conditions, in exceptional cases of need. Here the Methodist tendency is the exact opposite of the Presbyterian. The one would put the need for fairly frequent communion above the absolute requirement of an ordained minister to officiate; the other would reverse the order of importance. It must, however, be remembered that Sunday by Sunday four out of every five Methodist pulpits are occupied by lay preachers.

---

[1] *Ibid.* 28 f. *Cf.* J. S. Candlish, *The Sacraments*, p. 119 quoting Bruce's *Sermons* of 1590.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 29 f. [3] *Ibid.* p. 37.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 101.

[2] Ryder Smith, *The Sacramental Society*, p. 137.

[3] *Ibid.* 181.

If less has been said in this chapter about the Baptists and Congregationalists than about Methodists and Presbyterians that is because they have had little to say on the subject themselves. Their customs and teaching have been remarkably steady and consistent throughout their history. If there is any disposition to regard the experience of Churches other than the so-called "historic churches" as of little significance, it is well to remember that the last three hundred years of our national history are of far greater moment to all of us than the sixteen hundred years that preceded them. At least they are much more of our flesh and bones. Our recognisable ancestors live in us more potently than those dim shadows who may have been our mediæval forbears. So for three hundred years and more the Independent Churches have gone their accustomed way to the Supper of the Lord, according to His commandment and have been content with a spiritual presence that was grasped by no material means. They have continued to regard the elements of bread and wine as seals of grace as well as symbols. With equal steadiness the Society of Friends have maintained their position. The *Epistle* from the 1928 London Yearly Meeting might have been written by George Fox or William Penn if they had used the speech of the Twentieth Century:

> "Some knew this penetration of spirit" (with the presence of God) as a daily illumination. Others, who dare not claim so much for their individual vision, have yet often known the joy of communion where, Christ in our midst, we are made one in the fellowship of power and of overcoming love. This real presence lies at the heart of life. The Quaker community, in all its work and activity, is driven back for power and for guidance to this touch of the living God. In silence, without rite or symbol, we have known the Spirit of Christ so convincingly present in our quiet meetings that His grace dispels our faithlessness, our unwillingness, our fears and sets our hearts aflame with the joy of adoration. We have thus felt the power of the Spirit renewing and recreating our love and friendship for all our fellows. This is our Eucharist and our Communion."

The Quakers still echo the thought of Barclay, who considered the acceptance of the words of Jesus, "Do this in remembrance of me," as a piece of narrow literalism that was not followed in the symbol of the feet-washing. They have awakened responsive echoes in the hearts of many who have been accustomed to the ordered round of Sacraments. It was a Methodist, James Hope Moulton, who preached on that scene in the Upper Room under the title "A Neglected Sacrament." So the *London Epistle* goes on to say, "Could we but take this communion of the common life, how it would change our habitual ways of thought and action. We should no longer treat anyone as an inferior; we should find the meanest service that we receive from others or render to them transfigured by the light of that upper room where our Lord and Master washed the disciples' feet." Their numbers have not been largely increased since the seventeenth century, but their attitude has been reinforced by the customs of the Salvation Army, who have arrived at similar conclusions from another starting point. This neglect of the Sacraments must, however, be regarded as eccentric from the standpoint of the Free Churches. It is rather the expression of a certain temper of mind than a dangerous heresy. Most Free Churchmen would find it difficult to believe that the Lord Himself would reprove any of His followers who were obeying His injunctions in the spirit rather than the letter. Indeed, many of those who had accepted the findings of historical criticism would doubt whether our Lord had ever given any definite injunctions at all for the perpetual observance either of the Sacrament of Baptism or the Supper. They would not, however, on that ground deny the value of the Sacraments in the long history of the Church nor their continued validity. We come back in the end to experience, and to the unbroken sense of fellowship with the crucified and risen Lord which in this most sacred of rites has preserved its continuity. It has often been said, with scornful irony, that this place of uttermost fellowship of believers has been the chief place of division. Yet, in reviewing the different customs and ideas of the Free Churches as they have approached the Lord's Table, it is the unity of doctrine and of spirit that is far more impressive than their diversity. We find differences of posture adopted, frequent and infrequent communions, the use and the disuse of a liturgy, but when we come to ask the question, "What mean ye by this service?" nearly all the differences disappear. There are changes in emphasis but the same expressions, recur: "Memorials," "Signs," and "Seals" are the expressive words. The fellowship is one and the experience one. It is the Methodist W. M. Bunting who writes:

> Memorials, signs, and seals of grace—
> And channels too—I see:
> Nor would I fail the part to trace
> This service puts on *me*;
> With all Thy members I commune—
> Thy death show forth to men—
> And, grateful for the covenant-boon,
> Subscribe the bond again.

It is the Presbyterian, W. C. Smith, who says the devotional word that makes it impossible for any of us to be mere Sacramentarians in this holy place:

> I will remember all Thy love divine;
> Oh meet Thou with me where Thy saints are met,
> Revive me with the holy bread and wine,
> And may my love, O God, lay hold on Thine,
> And ne'er forget.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BAILLIE, ROBERT. *Letters and Journals* (1775).
BARCLAY, ALEXANDER. *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (1927)
BARCLAY, ROBERT. *Apology* (1679).
CALVIN, JOHN. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, 14–19 (Calvin Translation Society, Edition of 1845–6).
CANDLISH, R. S. *The Christian Sacraments* (1879).
CUNNINGHAM, W. *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation* (1862).
DALE, R. W. *History of English Congregationalism* (1907).
DEXTER, H. M. *The Congregationalism of last Three Hundred Years* (1880).
FORSYTH, P. T. *Lectures on the Church and Sacraments* (1917).
HODGE, CHARLES. *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (1871–3).
HUNTER, JOHN. *Devotional Services*, 8th edition (1903).
OWEN, JOHN. *Sacramental Discourses* (1760).
PATERSON, W. P. *Nature of Religion* (1928).
PEARSON, A. F. S. *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism* (1925).
PIETTE, MAXIMIN. *La réaction de John Wesley dans l'évolution du Protestantisme* (1925).

PLATT, F. *Immanence and Christian Thought* (1915).
POPE, W. B. *Christian Theology* 3 vols (1880).
POWICKE, F. J. *Richard Baxter: Under the Cross* (1927).
SCHAFF, P. *The Creeds of Christendom* (1877).
SHAW, W. A. *History of English Church during Civil War and under Commonwealth*, 2 vols. (1900).
SIMPSON, R. S. *Ideas in Corporate Worship* (1922).
SMITH, C. RYDER. *The Sacramental Society* (1927).
SMITH, WALTER CHALMERS. *Sacramental Hymns—in Poems* (Dent, 1902).
SMYTH, C. H. E. *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI.* (1926).
STALKER, J. Article "Sacraments (Christian Reformed)" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*
WATSON, R. *Institutes of Theology* (1834).
WESLEY, JOHN AND CHARLES. *Hymns on the Lord's Supper.*
WOTHERSPOON, H. S. *Religious Value of the Sacraments* (1928). *Before and After* (1900).
ZURICH LETTERS. 2 vols. Parker Society Publications (1842-1845).

IX. ANGLICAN EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY TO-DAY.

V. F. Storr.

The present chapter differs somewhat in kind from the others in this volume. They are in the main historical, and deal in turn with a definite period in the development of eucharistic doctrine, or with some special aspect of the subject, such as the New Testament background of the Lord's Supper, or the eucharistic theology of the Free Churches. In this chapter an attempt is made to sketch the outline of the controversy as it stands to-day, to state some of the problems which call for solution, and to emphasise various points of importance in the contributions of the other writers.

Each age is the heir of all past ages and its thought is inevitably moulded by earlier thought. Even the most violent reaction is a form of obedience to the past. But all the while change is going on because thought is a moving and growing thing. Sometimes an old problem disappears from the scene because its solution has been found. More often, and especially when it is concerned with fundamental, intellectual and spiritual issues, the problem changes its form. A new generation approaches it in a way different from that in which an older generation approached it, because it comes to it with the changed outlook which the growth of new knowledge has created. But while thought is always changing, there are unquestionably epochs in human history when the change is more rapid; and in such an epoch we are living to-day. This is one of God's creative moments, when the Spirit of Truth is leading us into a new and richer heritage.

The rise of the historical method has revolutionised research in every department, and not least in theology. Theology has been forced to become historical before it can dare to be dogmatic, and in becoming historical it has become critical of its own past affirmations. This must be so, for the historical method is a genetic method. It enquires into origins and aims at showing how the present has grown out of the past. Its keynote is continuity. But an enquiry into origins may, and often does, reveal the insecurity of the foundations upon which some later structure is built. The history of a doctrine is the implicit criticism of the doctrine; and history is but philosophy taking its time.

Can it be denied that the theology of the Eucharist is to-day in a state of transition? In the Evangelical wing of the Church a new feeling for sacramentalism is arising. Evangelicals are growing conscious that perhaps they have not given to the Sacraments, and especially to the Sacrament of Holy Communion, the place which they deserve in our common religious life, and are seeking to discover a fresh eucharistic theology which shall express itself in an enriched sacramental worship. Anglo-Catholic theologians, aware that in the light of modern knowledge some reinterpretation of older theories of the real presence is necessary, are engaged in trying to restate some of the fundamental problems connected with the Eucharist. The present situation therefore is of extraordinary interest, and this book appears at an opportune moment. It comes as a reminder that the historian cannot afford to neglect any aspect of the past, if he is to do full justice to his theme, and that seeds of past thought, like seeds in nature, may lie dormant for long periods and then come to fresh birth with amazing vitality.

These essays show how what may broadly be called the Evangelical strain in eucharistic theology has never been entirely absent from the Church. In two chapters, which give evidence of wide research and real learning, Dr. A. J. Macdonald traces the development of sacramental realism at the expense of the dynamic symbolism which originally characterised eucharistic theory. But this dynamic symbolism was never completely suppressed even when the tide was setting strongly in the direction of Transubstantiation. Dr. Macdonald carries the story down to Berengar. It is then taken up by the Rev. T. C. Hammond in a chapter on "The Schoolmen of the later Middle Ages," which contains a penetrating analysis of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the difficulties which S. Thomas Aquinas was trying to meet, and a lucid account of why those difficulties had arisen. Very valuable too is the section on Wyclif with which the chapter concludes. These four essays are not only a mine of information, but make clear how and why eucharistic controversy developed along certain lines. For the modern student who investigates the gradual growth of sacramental realism to its culmination in 1215 A.D., when Transubstantiation became the official doctrine of the Church, a point of living interest is the question whether we are not to-day moving back in eucharistic theory to the dynamic symbolism of the early centuries.[1]

The doctrine of Transubstantiation was the centre from which the whole development of Reformation theology started. The abuses to which the doctrine led roused Protestant theologians to examine the doctrine itself, with Scripture as their main guide. The problem which confronted them was first given definite form, as is shown in the chapter on "The Reformation of Doctrine" by Dr. Harold Smith, in a letter of Cornelius Hoen, in which, following a line of thought suggested earlier by Wessel, he definitely states that in the words of institution *est* is the equivalent of *significat*. "This is my body." Does "is" mean "symbolises" or "represents"; or does it imply that there is some invisible change in the consecrated elements of bread and wine? The storm-centre of eucharistic controversy has always been the question of the real presence; it remains the storm-centre to-day. In this chapter, which gives a clear summary of the movement of thought upon the Eucharist, both on the Continent and in England, we see the Reformers feeling their way towards a more satisfying doctrine. The pendulum in a reaction usually swings too far in the opposite direction, and it was so with some of the Reformers in the present case; though, as Dr. Smith reminds us, it is almost certainly unfair to regard even Zwingli as teaching a merely Memorialist doctrine. But it is probable that some of them had not appreciated the truly spiritual character of the teaching of Aquinas, being intent, and rightly intent, upon protesting against the materialism to which Transubstantiation lent itself in popular thought.

---

[1] That we are so moving is the contention of Canon Lilley in his recent book *The Sacraments* (Student Christian Movement).

No one can study the eucharistic theology of the Reformation as a whole without paying tribute to its sturdy common sense, its scriptural character, and its determination not to undervalue eucharistic experience. In this Reformation period dynamic symbolism strongly reasserts itself. Most of the Reformers stoutly affirm the spiritual presence; not any local presence in or under the bread and wine, but a true presence of Christ to the soul of the faithful communicant, who in the act of communion appropriates by faith His life-giving energy. A Christ spiritually present and spiritually active in this service was the positive teaching of the reformed theology, which emphasised anew, what in theory had always been allowed, that without faith and penitence on the part of the communicant no spiritual benefits were received. Dr. Smith points out that in the earliest period of the Reformation the language used by some of the writers seems at times to echo ideas which belong rather to a transubstantiationist doctrine, but this was only because they were anxious to assert that the communicant did in truth receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

The seventeenth century, which carried the Reformation in England to its completion, and created "Anglicanism" both as a theology and as a temper and outlook of mind, retained, as Canon Mackean shows in his chapters on "The Carolines and Hanoverians," the essential teaching of the Reformers upon the Eucharist. In this period there was much discussion as to the phrase "real presence," and considerable hesitation as to the advisability of using it. But, with hardly any exception, there is in this century a rejection both of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, and a clear recognition that the Anglican Church could come to no terms with Roman doctrine. There is also among these Carolines and Hanoverians no desire to tie the Church of England to any one specific interpretation of Holy Communion. It could include within its borders the Receptionist, the Virtualist, and the Memorialist. A succession of great men and great writers ended with Waterland, whose treatise on the Eucharist stands in the very first rank, and is still set as a subject for study in the examination of candidates for the priesthood. What is now needed is a book which shall state carefully the differences between the eucharistic teaching of the Caroline divines and that of the extremer Anglo-Catholicism which has sprung from the Tractarian movement, but under influences which would not have appealed to the original Tractarian leaders. Such a book would be both illuminating and instructive. It would make clear how the source of many of our confusions to-day is the rivalry between two standards of loyalty, loyalty to Anglicanism and loyalty to a somewhat indefinite thing called "Catholicism."

The rise of Anglo-Catholicism has unquestionably intensified controversy over the Eucharist, especially since the question of Reservation has become prominent. The gulf between Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical is wide. Yet there are many signs that the controversy is entering upon a new stage, with every prospect of a narrowing of this gulf. The old problem of the real presence still provides the main cause for dispute, but the form of the problem has changed, because our modern approach to it has altered. We may note, in passing, that the charge which has been brought against the Evangelical of being a believer in the "real absence" is increasingly being seen to be untrue. The dynamic symbolism of early eucharistic theory was based on the assumption that Christ was present at the service of Holy Communion, and there gave Himself as man's spiritual food. Reformation theology insisted that in this service Christ was truly present to, and active in, the soul of the believer. The Evangelical affirms as stoutly as does the Catholic the spiritual presence of Christ at the Eucharist; he differs from the Catholic only in the mode in which he conceives of that presence.

In approaching any problem much turns upon the presuppositions with which we start; and in two respects our presuppositions in this matter of the mode of Christ's presence have changed. We have abandoned the belief that the heavenly body of Christ occupies space. The literalism which accepted that view led to much controversy over the question how this heavenly body could be at one and the same time both in heaven and on the altar. The problem was insoluble so long as the body was regarded as occupying space. But denial that spacial characteristics belonged to the heavenly body was a confession that this body was not a body at all in the ordinary acceptation of the term. Our own physical bodies occupy space; but this characteristic of a body is not the most important thing about it. That surely is to be sought in the end or purpose which the body serves. Our bodies are the organs or instruments of our spirits. They are the medium through which we express our purposes and provide our means of communication with the outer world. When therefore we speak of Christ's heavenly body we really mean the organ or instrument through which He carries out His creative and redemptive purpose. What is this instrument? It can be nothing less than all the means by which He, the Logos or Word, sustains and controls the universe, though not all these means are equally expressive of His purpose. The air has been greatly cleared by the abandonment of this naive literalism in the matter of the heavenly body.

A second and more far-reaching change in presuppositions is concerned with the definition of a thing. Here the change affects Catholic rather than Evangelical doctrine, for the Evangelical, never having conceded that there is any presence of Christ in or under the bread and wine, is under no necessity to alter his view because of changes in philosophical outlook. The philosophy of Transubstantiationism is dead. We do not now believe that there is a hidden "substance" of a thing, which constitutes its essence, and in which its "accidents" or sensible properties inhere. Hence there can be no change at consecration of the hidden substance of the bread and wine into the hidden substance of the body and blood of Christ. A thing to-day is conceived either as the sum total of its qualities grasped as a unity by thought; or its reality is held to consist in the purpose which it serves, or the values which it exhibits. This means, as Canon Quick has pointed out, that the older theory of Virtualism is again coming to the front; for Virtualism emphasises the purpose to which the elements are put after consecration. "As used in the Sacrament they have the 'virtue' of Christ's Body and Blood, inasmuch as they are vehicles of Christ's gifts to the soul, though they cannot be ontologically identified with what they convey."[1] With the abandonment of the belief in a hidden substance under the sensible properties of a thing it becomes increasingly difficult to affirm that the act of consecration effects any change in the elements themselves. Obviously there is no visible change, and he who still maintains that there is a change, apart from the changed purpose to which the elements are put, must give some reasoned metaphysical theory of the change. To take refuge in a hidden mystery is to abrogate the use of reason and to refuse to serve God with our minds.

---

[1] *The Christian Sacraments*, by O. C. Quick (Nisbet & Co., Ltd.), p. 206. I am indebted in this section to this interesting and valuable volume.

An attempt to re-define the real presence in accordance with modern philosophical views about the nature of a thing has recently been made. In his essay "The Eucharist," in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, Mr. Spens defines an object as a "complex of persisting opportunities of experience which have a common situation in space,"[1] which is a definition of a thing in terms of its value or purpose. The bread and wine afford certain opportunities of physical experience. They nourish the body, have colour and the like. What happens to the bread after consecration? "After consecration it is changed, not by any change in the opportunities of experience which previously constituted the object, not by any change in anything which can be correlated in terms of electrons, but by the addition of opportunities of spiritual experience in that, by devout communion, we are made partakers in Christ. We are guilty of gross materialism if we think of the Host, or Chalice, in terms only of their physical properties, as purely physical objects, rather than in terms also of the opportunities of spiritual experience they afford, opportunities which are no less fundamental, and which are infinitely more significant."[2] Behind all physical objects is God, whose will guarantees that they shall afford these opportunities of physical experience. It is the same divine will which guarantees that after consecration the bread and wine shall afford opportunities for spiritual experience. It is unphilosophical to press the distinction between the physical and the spiritual, or to think of the material as somehow more real than the spiritual. All our experience forms a unity, and we must think of it in this way.

---

[1] P. 441 footnote.

[2] *The Real Presence.* A paper by A. E. Taylor and Will Spens read at the Anglo-Catholic Congress, London, 1927. *Cf.* Report, p. 114.

Whether this is a satisfactory definition of an object or thing, must be left to the metaphysicians to decide. It is not easy to think of an opportunity as being "here" or "there," as it must be if the complex of opportunities which constitute an object have spacial position. An opportunity is a possibility which may or may not be realised in a future experience. But my present experience of a fire is more than a possibility. It is a gratifying actuality on a cold day. In experiencing the warmth of the fire I am in contact with a real world, whose reality I experience in certain definite ways. An object surely cannot be defined solely in terms of the opportunities of experience which it affords.

But this new definition of the real presence is certainly free from any crude materialism. On this theory there is no local presence of Christ in the bread. Yet the bread has not simply been hallowed for a special purpose. It has in some way become the Body and Blood of Christ. Consecration adds to the complex of opportunities of experience which the bread affords, because it is the divine will that by consecration the glorified humanity of our Lord should become available for our sustenance by means of this sacramental food. Hence under the forms of bread and wine there is a presence, to which adoration is due, because it is the presence of Christ. Christ at His incarnation assumed a certain nature and for ever retains it. "That nature found a necessary expression in accordance with natural law in his natural body; it finds a necessary expression in accordance with the laws which, as yet, we do not know in his heavenly body; it finds a necessary expression sacramentally in Host, or Chalice, and that in a manner no less directly determined by the Divine Will. At consecration, bread and wine are not only changed, but they become objects which are what they are in virtue of, and because of, that same reality, that same sacred humanity, which lay no more directly behind our Lord's natural body, and which lies no more directly behind his heavenly body. It is as asserting this truth that we can speak of the bread and wine as transubstantiated."[1] Such a use, however, of the term Transubstantiation does not imply the acceptance of the scholastic theory of substance and accident, nor does it make consecration effect "a nature miracle rather than a miracle of grace" and so overthrow the nature of a Sacrament.

---

[1] Report of Anglo-Catholic Congress 1927, pp. 116, 117.

Mr. Spens defends the practice of continuous reservation on the ground that "when it is asserted that our Lord is present in the Reserved Sacrament, it is not a question of asserting something additional to the fact that Communion may be given by the Reserved Sacrament. If the Reserved Sacrament is in fact capable of giving Communion, precisely the arguments as to Eucharistic adoration which have already been advanced apply in the case of the Reserved Sacrament."[1] That is, the consecrated bread and wine when reserved retain outside the Communion Service the opportunities for experience of communion which they had inside the service. The same adorable presence of Christ is veiled under the reserved wafer as is veiled under it when it is used for the purpose of communion. Many will feel that, if we travel outside the original purpose for which the rite was instituted, the purpose of communion ("take and eat"), we have no guarantee that the presence will be vouchsafed.

This new view of the real presence has affinities with Virtualism, but its core is a revised Transubstantiationism which follows Roman eucharistic theory in placing immense emphasis on the moment of consecration, and upon an object, the consecrated Host. But, as Bishop Gore has pointed out, originally there was no such emphasis upon the moment of consecration. The Eucharist was viewed as a whole, a continuous action or process, and "the adoration was the adoration in preparation for the moment of communion."[2] The balance of the service is upset if one part of continuous action is thus emphasised. There can be little doubt that the doctrine of Transubstantiation arose as an attempt to find intellectual justification for popular devotional practices and demands. An uninstructed populace desired some visible and tangible focus for their devotion, and such was provided by the Host. It may be true that "for many at all times, and for all at times, sheer adoration is most possible when it is directed to some visible object which is reckoned an embodiment of God,"[1] but emotion is no sure guide to truth, and requires to be severely criticised. And a distinction must always be drawn between a devotional experience and the intellectual interpretation of that experience. A Chinese and an Englishman both experience a lunar eclipse. The one interprets it as the swallowing of the moon by a dragon; the other as due to the interpolation of the earth between the moon and the sun. All developments in eucharistic doctrine and practice have therefore to be tested.

---

[1] *Essays Catholic and Critical*, pp. 444, 445.

[2] *Reservation.* Addresses by the Bishops of Oxford and Chelmsford, 1917 (Longmans), p. 41.

What is to be our standard for testing these developments? The Evangelical will answer that we must go back to the Upper Room and the original institution of the Lord's Supper. The origin and early history of the Eucharist is obscure. Archdeacon Hunkin, in his admirable chapter, summarises the available evidence, and makes some interesting suggestions as to the probable lines along which the rite developed. The Dominical institution of the service can hardly be doubted, though there is a division of opinion as to whether Jesus intended to found a permanent rite. Time alone can show whether research will be able to discover more about its origin. But if we assume that Jesus did intend to found a permanent rite, the question arises whether the original service in the Upper Room was an imperfect or "shadow" sacrament, prophetic of something different in kind which was to come. All will agree that the rite became richer in meaning and association after Jesus had been crucified and had risen and ascended. The service could not possibly have had for those in the Upper Room the significance which it had later and has now for the Church to-day. But is the difference between the first institution and a modern celebration merely a difference in richness of meaning, or has the rite by divine appointment now moved on to a higher plane, so that Christ now gives to the faithful communicant something other than what He gave to the apostles? Has there been a *μέταβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*?

The Evangelical asserts that, allowance being made for the richer associations which have gathered round it, Holy Communion means now what it meant then, moves on the same plane, and has not changed its original character. Then He gave them bread set apart for a hallowed purpose, bread which was a symbol or representation of His body. To-day the communicant receives bread set apart for the same purpose. Then by His personal presence He was impressing Himself upon those who reclined at the table with Him. They caught the influence of His living personality through look, gesture, word. His life-giving activity towards us to-day in this service is of the same kind. He gives us "grace." But grace is a word which signifies personal influence and nothing more. The grace of God is the spiritual help which God gives me, the influence which He exerts upon me. Christ "feeds" us. The word is metaphorical, indicating, what no Christian denies, that Christ is the source of strength and sustenance for the soul's life. Where is the evidence that the rite has changed its essential nature? Appeal cannot be made to experience, for the experience has to be interpreted, and interpretations differ. A strong case can be made out for the assertion that a wrong line of development was taken in eucharistic doctrine when sacramental realism entered theology, and ideas associated with a heavenly substance or body, to be assimilated or eaten, took the place of those associated with personal influence or interpenetration of personality. The line of cleavage in this matter is sharply drawn between the rival schools of thought.

---

[1] *Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927*, p. 110.

The subject of instrumental sacramentalism requires careful examination. That the Sacrament of Holy Communion is instrumental in that it produces an effect is obvious; and in a general sense it may truly be asserted that the spiritual gift of Christ's body and blood is mediated to us through material means, through words spoken and acts done, into which we read a meaning. The whole service, including the reception of the elements, thus becomes a channel through which Christ feeds or sustains us. But, unless we accept belief in some heavenly substance which is somehow fused with the elements, can we assert that the spiritual gift of the Sacrament is conveyed to us through the specific medium of the consecrated bread and wine? No one questions that a spiritual meaning can be conveyed through a material medium. A kiss, a handshake, a flag are sacramental in that they arouse emotion and so convey a spiritual meaning. The material thing or the physical action has a significance which my mind appreciates. But what happens when my friend shakes hands with me? Does anything pass from him to me except a certain amount of heat generated by friction? What happens, surely, is that I make a rapid inference (almost instantaneous) that he is pleased to see me. I give a spiritual meaning to the physical contact. So when I receive the consecrated bread I give it a spiritual meaning, and it becomes to me an opportunity of realising the presence of the unseen Christ and of receiving life from Him. It is both my opportunity and His. My spiritual awareness becomes the occasion of His strengthening me with His personal influence.

This doubtless is Receptionist doctrine, though it is not open to the charge that it denies a spiritual presence and activity of Christ. But another charge is brought against it by the Catholic,—that it makes the reception of the gift dependent on my awareness and spiritual state at the time, whereas the Catholic likes to feel that, despite his dim faith and feeble spiritual perception, God gives him in the Sacrament a blessing greater than he knows. "The wind bloweth where it listeth . . . so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." Who can measure the ways in which God influences souls, or who will dare to deny that He may in this service influence us in modes of which we are not conscious? The Receptionist has no difficulty in admitting this. His quarrel is simply with the instrumental sacramentalism which treats the bread and wine, material things, as if they were *in themselves* vehicles of a spiritual gift.

Eucharistic controversy cuts deep because it touches our most sacred feelings and most hallowed associations. Yet, despite the existing cleavage of opinions, there are signs that the opposed schools of thought are drawing nearer together. On both sides there is a real will to understand the rival point of view, and to refuse to allow mere prejudice to stand in the way of reconciliation. And the movement of contemporary thought has led to the re-setting of some of the time-honoured problems in the debate; a re-setting which indicates that perhaps in the future opposed views will be found to involve a question of emphasis rather than entire contradiction. The reunion of Christian forces at home is unquestionably being hindered by our sacramental divisions. But Evangelicals in the Anglican communion are not fighting a lonely battle. Free Church eucharistic theology marches with their own. There are differences of emphasis and statement, as Dr. Harrison shows in his chapter "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Free Churches"; but in essentials the two theologies are one. And is it untrue to say that in the Free Churches, as among Evangelicals in the Church of England, there is the emergence of a new feeling for the Sacraments?

The present volume is a real contribution to the study of eucharistic doctrine. Such a book is greatly needed. It will help to restore the balance in the sacramental teaching of to-day, and will do much to refute the charge sometimes brought against Evangelicals in the Church of England, that they produce few scholars and are uninterested in theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE BISHOPS OF OXFORD AND CHELMSFORD. *Reservation* (1917),
GORE, C. *The Theological Bearings of Certain Extra-Liturgical Uses of the Blessed Sacrament* (1917). *The Body of Christ* (1901). *Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress* (1927). *Reservation—Report of a Conference held at Farnham Castle* (1926).
LILLEY, A. L. *Sacraments* (1928).
MEYRICK, F. *The Doctrine of Holy Communion* (1885).
QUICK, O. C. *The Christian Sacraments* (1927).
SCOTT, C. A., ANDERSON. *Christianity According to S. Paul* (1927).
SELWYN, E. G., and others. *Essays, Catholic and Critical* (1926).
TAYLOR, R. O. P. *Communion and Fellowship* (1924).
THOMAS, W. H. GRIFFITH. *The Principles of Theology* (1930).

Index

A

Abelard, 127ff., 137 n. 1, 139.
"Accidence and Accidents," 97 and n. 8, 112, 115, 132ff., 136, 139ff., 147, 173, 198, 210, 316, 318.
Adam, Karl, 75, 76 and n. 7, 77 n. 5, 80 and n. 9 and 10.
Adelmann, 108.
Aelfric, 104ff.
Agape, The, 44, 49.
Agobard of Lyons, 102.
Ahito, 89.
Alcuin, 89 and n. 3, 92, 94, 101.
Aldrich, Dean, 193, 243f.
Alexander III., 115.
Alexandria, 49.
Amalry, 102f.
Ambrose, 40, 48, 69 and n. 6, 70f., 85, 87, 95, 98, 102, 105, 112f., 114, 195, 212, 220, 229, 233.
Ambrosian realism, 87, 98, 101, 103, 106, 108.
Andersen, A., 41, 43 and n. 9, 49 n. 1, and 4.
Andrewes, Bp., 194ff., 209, 216, 232, 260, 286f.
Anglo-Catholicism, 301, 315.
Antioch, 19ff., 67.
Antiochenes, The, 65 and n. 5, 67.
"Antitype" and ἀντιτύπον, 63, 64 and n. 7, 65ff., 214, 229, 242, 259.
Antoninus Pius, 52.
Apostolic Constitutions, The, 65, 287.
Aquinas, Thomas, 116, 120ff., 123ff., 127, 129ff., 136 ff., 140 n. 1, 147, 201, 312f.
Aristotle, 68, 99, 112, 115, 120.
Arkwright, John, 30.
Arras, 107.
Assumption Theory, The, 51, 67 n. 4, 88.
Athanasius, 62f., 65.
Atonement, The, 28, 30.
Atto of Vercelli, 104.
Augsburg Confession, 160, 168, 173f.
Augsburg (Diet 1529), 159.
Augustine, 35f., 71ff., 85ff., 89 n. 3, 91f., 94, 97, 99, 100, 102, 105, 108f., 111ff., 122ff., 126, 129, 137 and n. 1, 138, 144, 168, 176, 182ff., 195, 198, 211, 229.
Augustine, Pseudo, 99.
Augustinian symbolism, 71ff., 80f., 85f., 88ff., 94ff., 100ff., 105, 107, 113, 116, 175, 183.
Autpertus (Ansbertus), 88f.

B

Bach, Josef, 93 n. 14.
Backer, De, 55, 59.
Badby, John, 148.
Baillie, Principal Robt., 274f.
Bandinelli, Roland, 115.
Baptists, The, 269, 278f., 282, 307.
Barclay, Dr. A., 163f., 170.
Barclay, Robt., 279ff., 308.
Barratt, T. H., 293.
Bareille, 81.
Basel, Confessions of, 170f.
Basil, 64 and n. 4, 257.
Batiffol, P., 41, 44 and n. 3, 52 n. 3, 63 n. 10, 64 n. 3, 66, 69 n. 6, 70f., 80 n. 7., 81 n. 3., 85 n. 1, 88, 100.
Bauer, 170, 173.
Baxter, 272ff., 275f., 278.
Bayly, Lewis, 223f.
Bede, 85ff., 94.
Bellarmine, 194f.
Berengar, 85, 92, 98, 100, 107ff., 119f., 120, 124, 127f., 135, 142, 147, 168, 173, 182, 184, 199f., 312.
Bernard, S., 258.
Berry, Dr., 299.
Bethune-Baker, Prof., 51 n. 8, 67.
Beveridge, W., 242f.
Beza, 229, 233, 238.
Bezae, Codex, 9f.
Bigg, C., 61.
Bilson, Bp., 202.
Bithynia, 49.
Black Rubric, The, 235f.
Bolzius, 287.
Book of Common Prayer, 26, 29, 37f., 160f., 210, 227, 255, 239, 244, 257, 267f., 272, 274f., 287, 294.
Box, Dr. G. H., 8.
Bradby, C. F., 29.
Bradford, John, 184f., 191.
Bramhall, John, 208ff., 260.
Brett, Thos., 238f., 251, 255.
Brevint, Dean, 287ff.
Brown, Robt., 265.

Bruce, Robt., 305.
Bucer, 157ff., 170, 190, 229, 233.
Buckeridge, John, 198f.
Bull, G., 240f.
Bullinger, 171ff., 177.
Bunting, W. M., 309.
Burnet, Bp., 235, 248ff.
Burns, 284.

C

Cœsarius of Arles, 82.
Calvin, 113, 145, 151ff., 160, 170, 173ff., 190, 198, 202, 212, 229, 233, 259, 269f., 275, 280f., 288, 295f.
Candidus of Fulda, 90f., 91 n. 10.
Candlish, Dr., 304.
Canons of 1640, 236.
Capito, 158f.
Cappadocians, The, 64ff.
Carlstadt, 154, 156ff., 159, 164, 166, 170.
Carolingians, The, 6 n. 4, 85, 88ff., 89 n. 3, 103f.
Cartwright, 264ff.
Cassander, 226.
Catacombs at Rome, 18 n. 1.
Catechism, The, 78, 152, 193, 215, 234, 244, 246.
"Censeri" and "Census," 56.
Charles the Bald, 94f.
Charles the Great, 85, 88f.
Chrysostom, 62, 68 and n. 4, 202f.
Clarke, Adam, 293.
Clarke, Samuel, 251.
Clement of Alexandria, 49, 61, 67ff., 69 n. 2.
Clement of Rome, 24 n. 1, 41ff.
Clementine Liturgy, The, 242.
Coins, 25, 26 n. 1.
Coleridge, S. T., 215.
Collier, Jeremy, 278.
"Communio" *cf.* "Communion, Holy."
Communion, Holy, 44f., 49f., 72, 80, 113.
"Commutatio," "Commutare," 69, 97.
"Conficere," 69, 72, 87, 93, 100, 113.
"Conformare," 93.
Congregationalists, The, 297, 299ff., 307 (*cf.* "Independents").
"Consecrare," 58f., 87.
Consecration, 77, 99, 100f., 106f., 109ff., 121f., 148, 197ff., 200, 204, 220f., 223, 234f., 254, 256, 259, 272, 316ff.
Consensus Tigurinus, 174, 177f.
Constantinople (Council 543), 62.
Consubstantiation, 67, 80 n. 9, 87, 101, 104, 113, 136, 142, 151, 189, 201ff., 209, 219, 233, 328, 249f., 255, 259f., 282, 314.
"Conversio," "Convertere," 69, 81, 87, 101, 103, 112f., 115.
Cooper, Dr. Jas., 301.
Corinth, 1f., 4f., 24, 26ff., 41.
"Corporaliter," 145, 216.
Cosin, B., 210f., 260.
Cotton, 283.
Crakanthorp, R., 221f.
Cranmer, 26, 37f., 124, 160, 170, 179, 185ff., 189ff., 197, 255, 260.
Cromwell, 274.
Cyprian, 40, 54, 60, 91, 137, 229.
Cyril of Alexandria, 67.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 54 n. 1, 67 and n. 1, 68.

D

D'Ailly, Peter, 151 and n. 1.
Dale, Dr. R. W., 296ff.
Damiani, Peter, 115, 123 and n. 1.
Deacon, Thos., 238, 287.
Demeter, 21.
De Sacra Cœna, 109.
Descartes, 118, 134.
Didache, The, 3f., 10, 18f., 41, 43ff., 50, 53 n. 3.
Dieckhoff, A. W., 156.
"Dimension," 132ff., 136, 142ff.
Dimock, N., 209, 216, 234.
Dionysius, Pseudo, 92 n. and n. 2.
Docetism, 40, 46, 51, 58.
Donatists, The, 80 and n. 7.
Druthmar, Christian, 91 and n. 10.
Dualism, 51, 55, 67, 81, 98, 102, 149.
Durand of Troarn, 115.
Dynamic symbolism, 48, 60ff., 79f., 80 n. 9, 87, 90, 92, 101, 105, 107f., 116, 312, 314f.

E

Eleusis, 21.
Egyptian Church Order, 65.
Epiclesis, The, 47, 54 n. 1, 68.
Epiphanius, 65.
Erasmus, 170.
"Essence" and "Essentia," 99, 112, 115, 128, 140 n. 1.
Essenes, The, 3.
Eucharist, The, 4, 18, 24 n. 1, 41ff., 49ff., 52f., 62, 166.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 64.
Eusebius of Emesa, 85.
Eustathius, 65.
Eutyches, 81.
Eutychius, 63.

Evening Communion, 293.
Expositio Canonis Missae, 115, 123.
Expositio Christianae Fidei, 168.

F

Facundus, 82.
Faith, 23, 26, 74f., 99, 140, 151, 160, 163f., 170, 172f., 177, 180 f., 186, 188, 196, 203, 224, 243, 314.
Faller, Otto, 69.
Farnsworth, Richard, 279.
Faustus of Riez, 85.
Fellowship Meal, 2ff., 10, 18f., 22, 43, 45, 47ff., 72, 300.
Feltoe, Dr. C. C., 87 n. 9.
Field, Bp., 224 ff., 260.
"Figure," "Figura," "Figurare," 55, 57ff., 60, 63ff., 70, 79, 86, 89, 91ff., 100, 102, 105, 111, 128ff., 137 f., 144, 146 f., 149, 154, 158, 167, 170, 173, 177, 183f., 186ff., 190, 193, 199f., 205f., 211ff., 216ff., 222f., 228ff., 238, 240ff., 246, 248, 250, 254, 259, 266, 277.
Fisher, Samuel, 280.
First Zurich Disputation, 162f.
Florence (Council, 1439), 88 n. 6.
Florus of Lyons, 102f.
Forbes, Bp., 239.
"Form," "Forma," 68, 77f., 97, 132f., 134 n. 4, 140 n. 1.
Forsyth, Dr. P. T., 299, 302.
Fox, George, 279f., 307.
Fraction, The, 44, 90.
Francis of Assisi, 279.
Frankfurt (Council, 794), 88.
Friends, Society of, 279f., 304, 307.
Fulbert of Chartres, 107f.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, 81f.

G

Gallic symbolism, 86 n. 10, 102f.
Gardner, Bp., 185.
Gaudentius, 70.
Geiselmann, 78 n. 3, 79 f., 87, 91, 98, 102, 104 n. 8, 105, 114f.
Gelasius I., 80f.
Gelasian Liturgy, 87.
Gerard of Cambrai, 107.
Germain of Paris, 85, 94.
Gezo of Tortona, 104.
Ghellinck, De, 59, 70.
Gibson, Monroe, 298.
Gnosticism, 40, 46, 51, 54 n. 1, 56, 58.
Goguel, M., 41ff., 49 n. 1, 52 n. 6, 53 n. 2.
Goode, Dean, 206.
Goodrich, Bp., 160.
Goodwin, 276, 278.
Gore, Bp., 14, 51 n. 8, 55, 63, 80 n. 9, 110, 319.
"Grace," "Gratia," 78f., 97, 111, 113, 116, 122, 132, 145, 181f., 185f., 188ff., 197, 203, 209, 245, 252ff., 283, 288, 307, 321.
Gratian, 119.
Gregory the Great, 80, 85, 115.
Gregory VII., 85.
Gregory of Nazianzus, 64 and n. 7.
Gregory of Nyssa, 62, 67 and n. 4, 68 f., 71, 88.
Gregory of Tours, 82.
Gregorian Liturgy, 87.
Grindal, Archbp., 264.
Gröne, De, 59.
Grynaeus, 171.
Guitmund, 69, 113, 115, 142.

H

Haddan, A. W., 219.
Hadrian, 49.
Hales, John, 232ff., 246, 260.
Halévy, M. Elie, 294.
Hall, Joseph, 230f.
Hammond, Henry, 206ff.
Hammond, Rev. T. C., 312.
Hampton Court Conference, 234, 272.
Harnack, A. von, 51, 53 n. 1 and 3, 54 n. 1, 55, 63, 67 n. 4, 69, 79, 95 n. 13.
Harrison, Dr. A. H. W., 323.
Hartopp, Sir John, 276.
Haymo of Halberstadt, 103.
Headlam, Dr., 24 n. 1.
Hebrews, Epistle to, 20, 29ff.
Hehn, 43.
Heidelberg Catechism, 178f.
Helvetic Confession, First, 171f.
Herbert, George, 206.
Heriger of Lobbes, 104f.
Hickes, George, 238f., 287.
Hilary, 69 and n. 3.
Hildebrand, 85, 108 (*cf.* "Gregory VII.").
Hincmar of Reims, 103.
Hodge, A. A., 296.
Hodgson, Ralph, 32.
Hoeck, Jacob, 154ff.
Hoen, Cornelius, 153f., 164, 170, 313.
Hoffmann, J., 44 n. 3, 45, 49 n. 1, 51 n. 8, 53 n. 4.
Holy Spirit, The, 68, 77, 82, 131, 174, 176, 178f., 181, 186, 196., 204ff., 219f., 224, 237f., 239, 241f., 245, 238, 256ff., 271, 273, 287.

Hoadley, Benjamin, 250f., 255, 260f.
Honorius III., 265.
Hooker, R., 144, 146, 149, 188ff., 191, 224, 254, 257, 264f., 298.
Hooper, J., 180f.
Horneck, 251.
Hort, Dr., 9.
Howe, 278.
Hugh of S. Victor, 122, 145.
Hughes, Hugh Price, 298f.
Humbert, 109 and n. 3, 114, 121.
Hunkin, Archdeacon, 320.
Hunter, John, 300.

I

Ignatius, 24 n. 2, 34ff., 41, 45ff., 51f., 53 n. 3, 61, 98, 104.
"Image," "Imago," 70, 81, 137, 241f., 259.
Impanation, 55, 137, 259.
Incarnation, 51, 88, 90, 137 n. 1.
Independents, The, 265, 269f., 274f., 276, 278f., 282f., 285, 297ff., 307 (*cf.* "Congregationalists").
Innocent III., 115.
Institution, The, 10ff., 13 n. 1, 37.
Irenaeus, 46, 54 and n. 1, 63, 67, 102, 195, 242.
Isidore of Seville, 85f., 88, 94, 97, 99.

J

Jackson, Bp., 261.
Jackson, Thos., 203ff., 260.
Jerome, 71, 86, 128f., 212, 229.
Jerusalem, Conference of, 20.
Jewel, Bp., 179, 187ff., 191, 260.
Joachim am Grüt, 168.
John S., 6, 33ff., 41, 45, 48 and n. 7, 52, 54, 63f., 71, 73f., 109, 124, 144, 148, 155f., 163 f., 166, 173, 175, 179f., 184, 186, 202, 217, 250, 255f., 281.
John of Damascus, 88, 94 and n. 4, 95, 259.
John the Scot, 91ff., 94, 98f., 108.
Johnson, John, 237ff., 245, 255f., 260, 287.
Jonas of Orleans, 90.
Josephus, 3.
Justin Martyr, 40f., 49ff., 49 n. 4, 172, 175, 242.

K

Kappel, Battle of, 162, 170.
Kempis, Thomas à, 153, 304.
Ken, Bp., 239f.
Kiddush, The, 7ff., 13 n. 1, 25 n. 1.
Klausner, 10.
Köhler, 170.

L

Lanfranc, 69, 107ff., 115.
Lateran Council, Fourth, 48, 85, 115, 120, 201f.
Latimer, Bp., 185 n. 1, 192, 260.
Laud, Archbp., 193, 201ff., 230, 252, 260, 286.
Lay administration, 24 n. 1, 296, 306.
Law, W., 251.
Legends, Eucharistic, 40, 85.
Leidrad, 89.
Leimbach, C. L., 55ff.
Leitzmann, 25 n. 1.
Leo I., 80.
Leo IX., 108.
Leonine Liturgy, 87.
Leontius of Byzantium, 66.
Lessing, 109, 114.
Libri Carolini, 89 n. 3.
Lilley, A. L. Canon, 313 n. 1.
Logos, The, 51, 62f., 65, 72, 77, 97, 98 n. 4, 99, 104, 112, 131, 148, 275, 316.
Lollards, The, 148f.
Lombard, Peter, 127.
Loofs, F., 40f., 43, 49 n. 1, 51, 54f., 59 f., 63, 67 n. 4, 68, 69 n. 6, 79, 95.
Lowther-Clarke, Dr. W. K. L., 49 n. 4.
Luke, S., 2ff., 9ff., 20, 163.
Luther and Lutherans, 113, 135f., 151f., 154, 158, 160, 162, 164, 168, 170, 172f., 175, 177, 190, 193, 201, 203f., 219, 225f., 249, 275, 295, 302.
Lyons (Council, 1274), 88 n. 6.

M

Macarius of Egypt, 65, 66 n. 5.
Macarius of Magnesia, 66.
Macdonald, Dr. A. J., 119 n. 1, 312.
Mackean, Canon W. H., 314.
Mackintosh, Dr. H. R., 151f., 174f.
Marburg Conference (1529), 159, 162, 164, 167.
Marcion, 56, 58.
Mark, S., 5f., 11ff., 15, 165, 223.
Mass, The, 53 and n. 4, 125, 137, 225.
"Matter," "Materia," 101, 112, 119, 133, 140 n. 1.
Matthew, S., 5f., 11ff., 165.
Maxentius of Aquileia, 89f.
Maximus the Confessor, 92 n. 2.

McCubbin, Rev. J. H., 48 n. 2, 57 n. 1.
Melanchthon, 160, 168, 174, 216, 295.
Memorialism, 111, 113, 153, 156, 158f., 161, 163, 165, 167, 169, 173, 182, 190f., 197, 222, 234, 241, 247, 250f., 253, 260, 276f., 288, 296ff., 309, 313f.
μεταβάλλειν, 68, 88.
Metabolism, 52, 54, 68, 71, 82, 85, 98, 101ff., 107f, 112, 176, 183 (*cf.* "Transubstantiation").
μεταμορφοῦν, 87 n. 9.
μεταποιεῖν, 67, 69, 88.
μεταῤῥυθμίζειν, 68 and n. 6.
μετασκευάζειν, 68.
μετασχηματίζειν, 68, 87 n. 9.
μεταστοιχειοῦν, 67.
Methodists, The, 286ff., 291ff., 295f., 306ff.
μετατιθέναι, 67.
μετουσίωσις, 88 n. 6.
Middleburgh, 267, 269.
Migne, 86.
Mishna, The, 11 n. 1, 13f., 25 n. 1.
Missal, The, 66.
Monophysites, The, 67, 69 n. 2, 81.
Morin, Dom., 104 n. 8.
Morton, Bp., 202, 228ff.
Moule, Bp. 177.
Moulton, Dr. J. H., 308.
Mountague, R., 202f.
Mozarabic Liturgies, 66, 70.
"Mutare," 69, 87, 197.
Myconius, 171.
"Mystery," μυστήριον, 55, 59, 61, 82, 86, 96, 98, 106, 138, 187f., 190, 198, 269, 277.
Mysteries, The, 21f., 40, 46, 60.

N

NAIRNE, Prof., 29.
Neo-Platonists, 76, 92ff. (*cf. Platonism*).
Nestorius, 67 and n. 5, 69, 81 and n. 3, 162.
New Week's Preparation, The, 251f.
Nicaea (Council, 787), 88.
Nicholas II., 108, 113.
Nicholson, 193.
Nicodemus, 36 n. 4.
Nisan, 5, 7 and n. 1, 8 n. 3.
Nock, A. D., 43 n. 9.
Nonjurors, The, 237ff., 242, 245, 251, 256, 286f.

O

ODA, Archbp., 105f.
Odes of Solomon, 20 n. 1.
Œcolampadius, 154, 168, 171, 177, 188, 202.
Olevianus, 178.
ὁμοιότης, ὁμοίομα, 63, 65.
Orchard, Dr., 300ff.
Orleans, 107.
Origen, 61ff., 69, 71, 74, 76 and n. 7, 77, 98 and n. 4, 99, 128.
Overall, Bp., 234.
Oxford Movement, The, 294.
Oxyrhynchus, 24.
Owen, John, 276ff., 280f., 290.

P

PASCHASIUS Radbert (*cf.* Radbert).
Passover meal, 5f., 6 n. 3 and 4, 9 n. 3, 11 and n. 1, 13.
Paul, S., 1, 3ff., 10, 12f., 20ff., 33f., 111, 155, 180, 200, 267, 269, 276.
Peck, Fr., 302.
Pember, G. H., 60.
Perkins, 192f.
Perron, Cardinal, 194f.
Philo, 17 n. 1, 22.
Philpot, John, 185 n. 1.
Piette, Fr., 286.
Plato and *Platonism*, 30, 60f., 76 and n. 7, 98, 101, 111f., 133 (*cf.* "Neo-Platonists").
Platt, Frederick, 195, 302.
"Pledge," "Pignus," 70, 79, 106, 111, 179, 191, 204, 258, 267, 271, 288.
Pliny, 49.
Pope, Dr. W. B., 295f.
Poukens, 54.
Poulain, Valeran, 269 n. 2.
Poynet, Bp., 260.
Prayer Book (*cf. Book of Common Prayer*).
Presbyterians, Presbyterianism, 265, 267, 269f., 274ff., 278, 282, 284f., 295f., 300, 303f., 306, 309.

Q

QUAKERS, The, 279f., 283, 307f.
Quick, Canon O., 316 n. 1.
"Quiddity," "Quidditas," 134, 139f., 140 n. 1.

R

RABANUS Maurus, 100 f.
Racovian Catechism, 162.
Radbert, Paschasius, 48, 94f., 100, 102ff., 114, 182.
Rather of Verona, 104.
Ratramn, 92, 94ff., 105ff., 182.
Rattenbury, Dr. J. E., 290f.

Rauschen, G., 43, 56 n. 5, 80, 81 and n. 3.
Real Presence, Realism and Realists, 40f., 43, 46, 48, 49 n. 1, 51 and n. 7, 53ff., 60, 66ff., 71f., 74, 77 n. 5, 78, 80, 82, 85ff., 93 n. 14, 94 and n. 4, 95 and n. 3, 100f., 103, 105, 107, 110, 113, 146, 152, 154, 156ff., 172ff., 182, 185ff., 189f., 192f., 197f., 202, 204ff., 208f., 212f., 215f., 221ff., 226ff., 235f., 239f., 243ff., 248f., 251ff., 259f., 290, 302, 312ff.
Receptionism, 193, 224, 260, 314, 322.
Reformation and Reformers, 48, 108, 114, 116, 129, 132, 151ff.
Remi of Auxerre, 103.
"Representare," "Representatio," 55f., 56 n. 1, 138, 155, 172f., 176, 180, 313.
Réville, J., 41, 43f., 49 and n. 1, 52 n. 6, 59.
"Res sacramenti," 74, 77f., 86, 88, 97, 111, 120ff., 195, 216, 244, 259.
Ridley, Bp., 181ff., 191, 260.
Rode (Rhodius), 154.
Rogers, Thos., 227f.
Rome (Synods of), 108, 119.
Rückert, L. J., 49 n. 1, 52, 54 and n. 1, 55, 60, 62, 68, 69 n. 2 and 3, 79, 89 n. 3, 98 n. 4, 101f.
Rule, Martin, 87 n. 9.
Rutherford, Samuel, 284f., 304.
Rutherford, W. G., 23.

S

"SACRAMENT" and "Sacramentum," 54f., 59f., 63, 70, 77f., 82, 86, 88, 101, 142.
Sacramentarians, The, 79, 111, 176, 188, 253, 302, 309.
Sacramentary of Serapion, 65.
Sacramentis, De, 66, 69.
Sacrifice, 28ff., 42ff., 53 and n. 3, 54, 60, 82, 111, 125ff., 130 and n. 1, 131f., 190, 197, 199, 203, 225, 241f., 264, 266, 288, 290.
Saganus, 154.
Salvation Army, 304, 308.
Sampson, Thos., 184.
Savoy Conference, 234f., 274.
Sawtre, William, 148.
Schnitzer, J., 95 n. 13, 97 n. 8.
Schröckh, J. M., 87 n. 7.
Scotists, The, 135, 140.
Scotland, 270, 272, 285, 295, 299, 301ff.
Serapis, 24.
"Sign," "Signum," "Significari," 72f., 75, 77ff., 100, 102, 104, 111, 122, 131, 137, 140ff., 147, 149, 154ff., 158, 163f., 168f., 171ff., 176ff., 184f., 186ff., 191, 193, 202, 209, 212f., 217, 223ff., 229ff., 233, 239, 242, 246, 253, 258f., 269ff., 288, 295f., 306, 309, 313.
"Similitude," "Similitudo," 63, 66, 70, 79, 81, 95, 102, 111, 230.
Simpson, Dr. R. S., 304f.
Smith, Chas. Ryder, 295, 300.
Smith, Dr. Harold, 313f.
Smith, W. C., 309.
Smyth, C. H. E., 160.
Smyth, John, 278f.
Socinianism, 253.
Soden, H. von, 55, 59.
Sophronius of Jerusalem, 92 n. 2, 94 and n. 4.
Spain, 88.
"Species," 97.
Spens, W., 317f.
Spurgeon, Chas., 298.
Srawley, Dr. J. H., 51 n. 8.
Stäudlin, C. F., 114.
Stephen of Beaugé, 116.
Steitz, G. E., 54 n. 1, 64 n. 4, 67 n. 5, 69 n. 2, 94 n. 4.
Stone, Dr. Darwell, 71 n. 3, 91 n. 10, 120, 200, 204.
Struckmann, A., 43, 44 n. 3, 52 n. 3, 54 n. 1, 62.
Supper, Last, 2ff., 9ff., 17f., 18 n. 1.
"Substance," "Substantia," 97ff., 112, 115, 119f., 133ff., 136, 139ff.
Sutton, Christopher, 199.
"Symbol," σύμβολον, 54f., 59, 61ff., 77, 79, 92f., 96, 105f., 147, 165, 212, 229.
Symbolism, 44f., 47f., 49 n. 1, 52 n. 6, 54ff., 58ff., 65f., 70f., 73f., 77f., 81f., 85, 89ff., 96ff., 101ff., 107, 137f., 161, 165, 167f., 171, 176f., 181, 183f., 186ff., 190f. 193, 195, 197, 206, 209, 211, 213, 217, 223, 237f., 241, 247, 257f., 298, 306f., 313, 321.
Synoptists, The, 2, 6 and n. 4, 7, 9ff.
Swete, Dr., 42f., 44 n. 4, 47 n. 1, 51 n. 8, 56 n. 1.

T

Talmud, The, 25 n. 1.
Taylor, Jeremy, 145, 193, 214ff., 252.
Temple, Archbp. 290.
Tertullian, 24 n. 1, 49 n. 4, 54ff., 77 and n. 5, 81, 138, 184, 229.
Tetrapolitana, Confessio, 159.

Thorndike, Herbert, 218ff., 252, 260.
Tillotson, 246ff., 260f.
Thanksgiving, 42ff., 49f., 62.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 66.
Theodoret, 65 and n. 5, 81 n. 3, 195.
Theodulf of Orleans, 90.
Tosephta, The, 8, 25 n. 1.
Tours (Synod, 1054), 108.
Trajan, 49.
"Transfigurare," 69, 212.
"Transformare," 67f., 72, 87 n. 9, 88.
"Transmutare," 87, 197, 212.
Transubstantiation, 25, 31, 64 n. 4, 65 n. 5, 67 and n. 4, 68, 69 and n. 6, 70, 72, 76, 85 and n. 1, 86 87 and n. 9, 88 and n. 6, 95 n. 13, 98, 107, 113, 115f., 119f., 136ff., 147, 149, 156, 173f., 176, 179, 183f., 187, 189, 192, 194, 197ff., 209, 211, 214f., 217, 219, 222, 225, 228f., 233, 240f., 243, 246, 248, 250, 252f., 255, 259f., 266ff., 271, 274, 282, 287, 290, 295, 312ff., 316, 318f (*cf. Metabolism*).
Travers, 264f.
Trent (Council of), 48, 115, 125, 216, 219, 235, 241, 253.
Trevelyan, Prof. G. M., 136, 148.
"Triers, The," 274.
Troas, 3f.
"Trope," "Tropical" (*cf.* "Figure").
Tyndale, 179f., 190f.
"Type," τύπος, 61, 64, 66f., 76, 212, 217, 229, 242.

U

Ubiquitaries, The, 227.
Unleavened Bread, 6 n. 4.
Unitarians, The, 283, 285.
Ussher, Archbp., 126, 231f.
Ursinus, 178.

V.

"Value," 61, 71, 76, 79, 99, 101, 107, 111, 113, 116, 169f.
Vercilli (Synod of), 92, 109.
"Veritas," 86, 88f., 96ff., 99, 137, 144.
Virtualism, 137, 143, 145, 147, 193, 197, 205, 238, 240, 244f., 260, 314, 316, 319.
"Virtue," 77ff., 81, 86, 89, 97, 99, 101, 111, 113, 116, 169, 177, 181f., 186, 197, 200, 204ff., 223, 239, 282.
Vischer, A. F. and F. Th., 109, 114.
Völker, K., 49 n. 4.

W

Wake, Archbp., 194, 196f., 220, 252ff., 260f.
Walafrid Strabo, 102.
Waterland, 130, 239, 243, 251, 255ff., 261, 314.
Watson, Richard, 295.
Week's Preparation, A, 251f.
Wesley, Charles, 288, 291.
Wesley, John, 285ff.
Wesley, Samuel, 286f.
Wesley, Susannah, 286.
Westminster Assembly of Divines, 270, 274, 278, 285, 297.
Westminster Confession of Faith, 270ff.
Westphal, 174.
Wessel Gansfort, 153f., 156, 313.
Whitgift, Archbp., 264ff.
Wilberforce, Archdeacon R. I., 239.
Wilson, Thos., 244ff., 260.
Wood, Anthony, 222.
Woodhead, Abraham, 252.
Word, The (*cf.* "Logos").
Workman, Dr. H. B., 136f.
Wotherspoon, W. S., 301ff.
Wulfsin, Bp. of Sherborne, 106.
Wulstan, Archbp. of York, 106.
Wyclif, 116, 122, 132ff., 313.

Z

Zanchi, 226.
Zwingli and Zwinglianism, 113, 130, 151, 154, 160ff., 174, 176f., 188, 190, 194, 202, 209, 225, 244, 253, 255, 259ff., 313.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

Printed by
W. Heffer and Sons Ltd.,
Cambridge, England.

BV
823
M25
1930

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CA
91711

1/00

DEMCO